

Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in Chronicles

The story of David's census and plague is a *crux interpretum* in the Chronicler's depiction of an illustrious reign⁽¹⁾. Following the failure and death of Saul (1 Chr 10,1-14), David initiates a most auspicious era in Israelite history. Unanimously and immediately acclaimed by all Israelites, David is victorious in war, successful in cult, adept in politics, and diligent in administration. Given this highly stylized and flattering portrait of David, scholars are puzzled by the Chronicler's incorporation of the census and plague account from 2 Samuel 24 into his narrative. David's census is the only blemish in an otherwise glorious career. How does one explain this apparent anomaly?

Each of the major scholars theories about this episode reflects insight into particular features of the Chronicler's presentation, but

(¹) By the Chronicler, I mean the author of Chronicles. A number of recent scholars have forcefully argued against the single authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah; see S. JAPHET, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew", *VT* 18 (1968) 330-371; id., "The Relationship between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah", *Congress Volume, Leuven 1989* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (VTS 43; Leiden 1991) 298-313; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (New York 1977) 5-70; I. KALIMI, "Die Abfassungszeit der Chronik — Forschungsstand und Perspektiven", *ZAW* 105 (1993) 223-233; S. TALMON, "Esra und Nehemia: Historiographie oder Theologie?", *Ernten was man sät. Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (ed. D.W. DANIELS et al.) (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1991) 329-356. Some of the arguments for separate authorship have been challenged by J. BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia 1988) 47-54; D. TALSHIR, "A Reinvestigation of the Linguistic Relationship Between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah", *VT* 38 (1988) 165-193; R. NORTH, "The Chronicler: 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah", *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R.E. BROWN — J.A. FITZMYER — R.E. MURPHY) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1990) 362-363; and K.-F. POHLMANN, "Zur Frage von Korrespondenzen und Divergenzen zwischen den Chronikbüchern und dem Esra/ Nehemia-Buch", *Congress Volume, Leuven 1989*, 314-330. I believe that more than one author is responsible for Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, but I do not deny that some connections exist between them.

does not amount to a compelling explanation of the whole. Some commentators ascribe the appearance of the story in Chronicles, at least in part, to an interest in exegesis⁽²⁾. This interpretive strategy calls attention to how the Chronicler reinterprets and reapplies his *Vorlage*, but functions only as a penultimate explanation of the text⁽³⁾. The question remains why the Chronicler retains and reworks this particular incident⁽⁴⁾.

(2) W.E. BARNES, "The Midrashic Element in Chronicles", *The Expositor* 5/4 (1896) 427; T. WILLI, *Die Chronik als Auslegung* (FRLANT 106; Göttingen 1972) 170-171. T. Sugimoto argues that the Chronicler creates a typology by harmonizing his *Vorlage* (2 Samuel 24) with reference to three other texts (Num 22,21-35; Judg 6,11-24; Gen 23,3-20), "The Chronicler's Techniques in Quoting Samuel-Kings", *AJBI* 16 (1990) 63-65.

(3) As a number of scholars have demonstrated, one cannot assume that the Chronicler's *Vorlage* was identical to the MT of Samuel. Differences among the textual witnesses to Samuel (e.g., MT, LXX, 4QSam^a, Josephus) and Chronicles suggest a complex picture of textual development. One should not always presume, therefore, that whenever Chronicles differs from Samuel this discrepancy results from the Chronicler deliberately altering the text of his *Vorlage*; see further W.E. LEMKE, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History", *HTR* 58 (1965) 349-357; E.C. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, MT 1978) 1-37; P.K. MCCARTER, *I Samuel* (AB 8; New York 1980) 5-11; id., *II Samuel* (AB 9; New York 1984) 502-518; S.L. MCKENZIE, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM 33; Atlanta 1985) 55-58; A. ROFÉ, "4QSam^a in the Light of Historico-literary Criticism: The Case of 2 Sam 24 and 1 Chr 21", *Biblische und judaistische Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi* (ed. A. VIVIAN) (Judentum und Umwelt 29; Frankfurt am Main 1990) 110-119. By the same token, the LXX Books of Kingdoms exhibit their own distinctive characteristics and *Tendenz*, W.M. SCHNIEDEWIND, "Textual Criticism and Theological Interpretation: The Pro-Temple *Tendenz* in the Greek Text of Samuel-Kings", *HTR* 87 (1994) 107-116. Moreover, no one doubts that the Chronicler both selected from and supplemented his *Vorlage*. Hence, whatever the cause of the discrepancies between the various textual traditions, one must ultimately deal with the text of Chronicles as best one can reconstruct it.

(4) Nor should the Chronicler's dependence upon a text that is somewhat different from the MT of Samuel obscure the Chronicler's innovative use of his sources, P. DION, "The Angel with the Drawn Sword (II Chron. 21.16 [sic]): An Exercise in Restoring the Balance of Text Criticism and Attention to Context", *ZAW* 97 (1985) 114-117; J.W. WRIGHT, "The Innocence of David in 1 Chronicles 21", *JSOT* 60 (1993) 87-89.

Perhaps the majority of commentators attributes the inclusion of this story to an authorial concern to validate the threshing floor of Ornan as the future site of the temple⁽⁵⁾. In this line of interpretation, the Chronicler tolerates some unsavory details about David because the story of the census “culminates in the providential choice of a site for the Temple”⁽⁶⁾. This influential theory highlights the important links that the Chronicler posits between this incident and the construction of the temple, but fails to explain major characteristics of the census and plague story. To begin with, David is the main character throughout the story. He is mentioned twenty-five times in 1 Chr 21,1–22,1⁽⁷⁾. In contrast, the temple is explicitly mentioned only at the story’s very end⁽⁸⁾. If the Chronicler wished to validate the temple, it is unclear why he consistently keys on the figure of David⁽⁹⁾. Similarly, why does the

⁽⁵⁾ M. NOTH, *The Chronicler's History* (JSOTSup 50; Sheffield 1987) 34, 55-56; K. GALLING, *Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia* (ATD 12; Göttingen 1954) 59-62; W. RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 21; Tübingen 1955) 141-149; P. R. ACKROYD, *Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah* (TBC; London 1973) 73-77; R. MOSIS, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (Freiburg 1973) 104-124; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCB; Grand Rapids 1982) 142-151; T.-S. IM, *Das Davidbild in den Chronikbüchern: David als Idealbild des theokratischen Messianismus für den Chronisten* (Europäische Hochschulschriften 23; Frankfurt am Main 1985) 145-153; R. L. BRAUN, *1 Chronicles* (WBC 14; Waco 1986) 212-218; W. JOHNSTONE, “Guilt and Atonement: The Theme of 1 and 2 Chronicles”, *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane* (ed. J. D. MARTIN – P. D. DAVIES) (JSOTSS 42; Sheffield 1986) 123-124; S. J. DE VRIES, *1 and II Chronicles* (FOTL; Grand Rapids 1989) 177-180; R. K. DUKE, *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis* (JSOTSS 88; Sheffield 1990) 59-60; G. H. JONES, *1 & 2 Chronicles* (Old Testament Guides; Sheffield 1993) 39.

⁽⁶⁾ W. E. BARNES, “The David of the Book of Samuel and the David of the Book of Chronicles”, *The Expositor* 7/7 (1909) 52.

⁽⁷⁾ The centrality of David throughout this narrative is stressed by WRIGHT, “Innocence”, 98-104.

⁽⁸⁾ 2 Chr 22,1. But the threshing floor as a sacred precinct is alluded to twice before (מקדש; 1 Chr 21,22.25). See below.

⁽⁹⁾ D. M. Gunn and D. N. Fewell think that the author of 2 Samuel 24 displays a primary interest in Israel, because of the corporate emphasis in the introduction and conclusion to the census narrative (2 Sam 24,1.25), *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford Bible Series; Oxford 1993) 125-128. If so, this only amplifies the contrast with 1 Chr 21,1–22,1. In the Chronicler’s introduction and conclusion the figure of David is prominent (1 Chr 21,1; 22,1).

Chronicler include, indeed supplement, earlier parts of the narrative that underscore David's folly? Why does he not temper or even omit portions of his *Vorlage* that reflect negatively on David's conduct? Finally, if the point of the story was establishing the site of the temple, it is unclear why the course of the plague is checked by YHWH without any reference to this future sanctuary⁽¹⁰⁾.

Japhet offers a third explanation⁽¹¹⁾. Recognizing an emphasis on David's responsibility in 1 Chronicles 21, she views the Chronicler's inclusion and shaping of this story as proof of the Chronicler's abilities as an honest broker of history. The Chronicler purportedly balances the positive and negative aspects of David's career. Japhet calls attention to the Chronicler's penchant for juxtaposing the meritorious aspects of a monarch's reign with its deficiencies. Such parity is a consistent feature of the Chronicler's historiography of the Judahite kingdom (2 Chronicles 10–36). Nevertheless, one wonders why the Chronicler's putative quest for balance does not lead him to include more negative material about David⁽¹²⁾. Certainly, there was plenty to choose from in 2 Samuel and 1 Kings 1–2⁽¹³⁾. Moreover, the Chronicler supplies no corresponding negative material for Solomon, the other king in the united monarchy whom the Chronicler idealizes. The Chronicler omits, in fact, all of the explicitly critical material about Solomon in

⁽¹⁰⁾ A point stressed by E. Ben Zvi (private communication).

⁽¹¹⁾ S. JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville 1993) 370–390.

⁽¹²⁾ The Chronicler presents the united kingdom as a unity, the time in which Israel's normative institutions take shape. In this respect, one must distinguish the Chronicler's historiography of the united monarchy from his historiography of the dual monarchies, R. L. BRAUN, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles", *JBL* 92 (1973) 503–516; H. G. M. WILLIAMSON, "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles", *VT* 26 (1976) 351–361; G. N. KNOPPERS, "'Battling against Yahweh': Israel's War against Judah in 2 Chr 13,2–20", *RB* 100 (1993) 511–522.

⁽¹³⁾ I am assuming that the Chronicler's *Vorlage* contained the succession narrative or court history (commonly defined as 2 Samuel 9–20; 1 Kings 1–2). J. Van Seters argues that the court history is a late addition to the Deuteronomistic History, but he does not deny that this addition was part of the Chronicler's version of Samuel-Kings, *In Search of History* (New Haven 1983) 277–291. A. G. Auld presents a dissenting view, namely that the Chronicler and the Deuteronomist(s) drew on a common, shorter source, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh 1994). For a critique of this theory, see my review of Auld's book in the *Ashland Theological Review* (forthcoming).

Kings from his history⁽¹⁴⁾. The comparison with a completely sanitized Solomon makes the errant David of 1 Chronicles 21 all the more striking. The census is the only apparent defect in the performance of either David or Solomon in the Chronicler's History.

Acknowledging problems with earlier theories, Wright offers a fourth explanation. Reading Chronicles on its own terms, Wright thinks that Joab and not David is to blame for Israel's crisis⁽¹⁵⁾. By failing to complete the census (1 Chr 21,6), Joab jeopardizes the fate of his nation. Innocent David vicariously accepts divine punishment to save his kingdom. Hence, in Wright's view, the Chronicler subverts the narrative of 2 Samuel 24 through deft editorial activity⁽¹⁶⁾. On two points, Wright's position is well-taken. First, the Chronicler's presentation, however indebted to its *Vorlage*, evinces its own distinctive point of view. The content and context of the Samuel narrative should not be assumed to hold true for Chronicles. Second, the Chronicler normally exhibits no aversion to musters⁽¹⁷⁾. Quite the contrary, large numbers of people and troops are usually an indication of divine blessing⁽¹⁸⁾. But there are also two shortcomings in Wright's theory. First, there is no clear indication that the Chronicler blames Joab for the disaster that befalls Israel⁽¹⁹⁾. Second, the Chronicler, as we shall see, actually accentuates David's stigma over against the narrative of 2 Samuel 24. Even more so in Chronicles than in Samuel, David is guilty.

This essay asks whether the issue of David's unblemished character has been misconstrued. Three of the four major explanations of the census and plague story assume that the criticism of David in the census narrative is a problem. The Chronicler's inclusion of the census and plague story is thought to

⁽¹⁴⁾ G. N. KNOPPERS, "Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?", *JBL* 109 (1990) 423-429.

⁽¹⁵⁾ "Innocence", 87-105.

⁽¹⁶⁾ "Innocence", 104.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Pace N. BAILEY, "David's Innocence: A Response to J. Wright", *JSOT* 64 (1994) 83-90.

⁽¹⁸⁾ WRIGHT, "Innocence", 89-92. The situation in 2 Samuel 24 is complex. Scholars disagree about why a census should incur divine wrath (Exod 30,11-16; Num 1,2-54; 26,2-65). McCarter provides a survey of opinion, *II Samuel*, 512-514.

⁽¹⁹⁾ BAILEY, "David's Innocence", 87-90.

undercut David's role as an exemplary king. It is precisely this assumption that needs to be reexamined. In my judgment, David's acknowledged culpability does not disqualify him from serving as a paradigmatic figure to the Chronicler's postexilic audience. The Chronicler's portrayal of David is more complex. The stress on Davidic responsibility may be understood in the context of a larger movement characterized by wrongdoing, confession, intercession, renewed obedience, and divine blessing. The story of the census, plague, and establishment of a permanent altar underscores the highly positive consequences of David's ability to confront and manage his own failure. David's unequivocal admission of guilt, his mediation on behalf of Israel, his diligent observance of divine instructions, and his securing a site for the future temple contribute positively to his legacy.

Approaching David as the model of a repentant sinner elucidates prominent features of the Chronicler's version of the census story. Because the Chronicler portrays David's sin as part of a broader process beginning with repentance and ending with divine blessing, he has no interest in denying David's culpability. On the contrary, I will argue that in the first part of the census narrative the Chronicler clarifies and accentuates David's responsibility for the plague, while in the latter part of the narrative the Chronicler accentuates the positive outcome of David's intercession and obedience. The stylized movement that the Chronicler creates from Davidic transgression to a miraculous divine affirmation of his sacrifices serves two purposes. First, it enables the Chronicler to present the establishment of David's altar as a permanent fixture in the history of Israel's cult. The Chronicler draws upon Deuteronomic and Priestly theologies to present David's altar as the focal point around which the venerable but separate institutions of the ark and the tabernacle can find a common home. Second, the extraordinary contrast between the initial punishment of royal infraction and the divine forgiveness amplifies the significance of David's intercession with YHWH. The hope, expressed quite commonly in the psalms, for YHWH to have compassion on and dramatically reverse the plight of the supplicant is realized in the Chronicler's version of the census and plague⁽²⁰⁾.

⁽²⁰⁾ C. WESTERMANN, *Praise and Lament in the Psalms* (Atlanta 1981) 64-71, 181-213; W.L. HOLLADAY, *The Psalms Through Three Thousand Years* (Minneapolis 1993) 49-52; P.D. MILLER, *They Cried to the Lord: The Form and Theology of Biblical Prayer* (Minneapolis 1994) 55-134.

I. The Chronicler's Version of David's Sin

The first and most famous change the Chronicler introduces into the Samuel narrative — attributing the idea for the census to *śāṭān* (1 Chr 21,1) and not YHWH (2 Sam 24,1) — reflects, in my judgment, the Chronicler's quest to clarify why David's actions incur divine wrath⁽²¹⁾. As Japhet and Day have argued, the most plausible meaning for the indefinite noun *śāṭān* is “an (anonymous) adversary”⁽²²⁾. The use of *śāṭān* instead of YHWH cannot be convincingly attributed to a shift in metaphysics from the preexilic to the postexilic age, because Chronicles nowhere else evinces an inherently dualistic view of reality⁽²³⁾. The Chronicler is as much of a monist as the Deuteronomists are⁽²⁴⁾. A more convincing explanation for the switch in subjects emerges after one considers the challenge that the Samuel narrative posed for the Chronicler's ideology⁽²⁵⁾. Because the Chronicler considered musters as an appropriate feature of royal administration, he risked presenting his audience with an untenable scenario. If he did not alter his *Vorlage*, YHWH would be prompting David to do something good and then punishing him for doing it.

The larger context in Chronicles, as opposed to that of Samuel, is also important. By introducing the census narrative with the

⁽²¹⁾ *Tg. Ket.* 1 Chr 21,1 conflates the reading of 2 Sam 24,1 with that of 1 Chr 21,1, “and YHWH raised up Satan”.

⁽²²⁾ S. JAPHET, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums 9; Frankfurt am Main 1989) 145-149; id., *Chronicles*, 373-375; P. L. DAY, *An Adversary In Heaven: śāṭān in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM 43; Atlanta 1988) 127-145.

⁽²³⁾ 1 Chr 21,1 is the only mention of שטן or השטן in Chronicles. For arguments that שטן refers to a human enemy (as opposed to celestial adversary or a prosecuting attorney within the divine council), see JAPHET, *Ideology*, 147-149 (cf. Zechariah 3; Job 1-2; DAY, *śāṭān*, 144).

⁽²⁴⁾ G. N. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*, 2: *The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah* (HSM 53; Atlanta 1994) 229-254.

⁽²⁵⁾ The narrative in 2 Samuel 24 presents, of course, its own set of compositional and interpretive issues; see most recently A. ROFÉ, “4QSam^a”, 111-114, and B. A. LEVINE, “The Lord your God Accept You” (2 Samuel 24,23): The Altar Erected by David on the Threshing Floor of Araunah (Hebrew)”, *Avraham Malamat Volume* (ed. S. AḤITUV – B. A. LEVINE) (*ErIsr* 24; Jerusalem 1993) 122-129.

words, “and YHWH again became angry with Israel and incited David to number Israel”, the author of 2 Samuel 24 alludes to an earlier instance of divine wrath against the people: the story of the famine in 2 Samuel 21⁽²⁶⁾. Whereas in Samuel YHWH induces David to number Israel to implement YHWH’s anger against the people, in Chronicles there is no sign of divine displeasure until Joab implements David’s command to undertake a census (1 Chr 21,7). Nor is there any earlier famine or national catastrophe in the Chronicler’s version of David’s reign. The idea for the census stems from one of David’s unnamed adversaries, who “took a stand against Israel” (ויעמד שטן על־ישראל; 2 Chr 21,1). Having just experienced a string of impressive military victories against the Ammonites, Syrians, and the Philistines (1 Chronicles 18–20), David uncritically falls to the designs of one of his opponents, who “incited him to number Israel” (ויסס את־דוד למנות את־ישראל; 1 Chr 21,1)⁽²⁷⁾. The change over against Samuel accomplishes, therefore, two things. By attributing the census to the instigation of an anonymous adversary, the Chronicler simultaneously excuses YHWH from any responsibility for the census and casts a pall over David’s entire plan⁽²⁸⁾. In the context of the Chronicler’s narrative, the issue becomes not the census, but that one of David’s enemies has successfully induced him to order such a maneuver⁽²⁹⁾. The Chronicler’s narrative clarifies and underscores David’s accountability.

The Chronicler’s desire to focus the burden of responsibility upon David also elucidates his depiction of Joab’s role. In both Samuel and Chronicles Joab objects to David’s determination to number the people (2 Sam 24,3; 1 Chr 21,3). In both cases, Joab’s protests challenge the legitimacy of David’s plan. But the objections of Joab in Chronicles are more pronounced and more severe than

⁽²⁶⁾ Most recently, A. CAQUOT – P. DE ROBERT, *Les Livres de Samuel* (CAT VI; Genève 1994) 575-589, 627-643.

⁽²⁷⁾ Even if one allows, for the sake of argument, a more neutral translation of the verb סית (i.e., “to persuade”; WRIGHT, “Innocence”, 93), the use of the verb with this particular subject (שטן) suggests that the circumstances surrounding this particular census are highly suspicious.

⁽²⁸⁾ Contra E.L. CURTIS – A.A. MADSEN, *The Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1910) 246.

⁽²⁹⁾ David’s census is not a valiant response to the (military) threat posed by a foe, but the product of that anonymous enemy’s activity, *pace* WRIGHT, “Innocence”, 93-95.

the diplomatically-worded objections in Samuel. Only in Chronicles does Joab explicitly describe David's plan as bringing "guilt upon Israel" (למה יהיה לאשמה לישראל). The terminology is significant⁽³⁰⁾. Joab warns David that his census of Israel will have negative ramifications for Israel. Similarly, only in Chronicles does Joab refuse to complete the muster. Whereas the author of Samuel provides a detailed presentation of Joab punctiliously implementing the muster throughout the entire land (2 Sam 24,4-8), the Chronicler's shorter version of the muster presents Joab as deliberately excluding Benjamin and Levi, because "the command of the king was abhorrent to Joab" (1 Chr 21,6)⁽³¹⁾. The Chronicler's version of Joab's conduct lessens his responsibility, rather than heightens it.

If Samuel and Chronicles present two distinct versions of Joab's behavior, they also present two different accounts of how David comes to acknowledge his misconduct. As soon as David hears Joab's enumeration of Israel's strength in Samuel, David's conscience is stirred (ויך לב-דוד אתו: literally, "the heart of David struck him") and he confesses his transgression to YHWH (2 Sam 24,10-11). The Chronicler depicts, however, a different sequence of events. In Chronicles, YHWH deems the census to be evil and strikes Israel (ויך את-ישראל)⁽³²⁾. Only then does David confess

⁽³⁰⁾ P. JOÜON, "Notes de lexicographie hébraïque, XV, Racine 'šm", *Bib* 19 (1938) 454-459 and J. Milgrom observe that the term אשם can connote both the wrong and the retribution, *Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 18; Leiden 1976) 3-12. In other words, David's wrongdoing will inevitably lead to punishment. See also the comments of JOHNSTONE, "Guilt and Atonement", 119-126.

⁽³¹⁾ In 1 Chr 21,6 I read נהעב with the MT (maximum variation). The LXX^B reads κατίσχυσεν, while the LXX^A has κατετάχυσεν. The LXX^B may reflect an original נבעת (metathesis), L. C. ALLEN, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Masoretic Text* (VTS 27; Leiden 1974) II, 11. Another possibility is that the LXX^B assimilates toward the phraseology of 1 Chr 21,4 (ודבר-המלך חזק על-יואב). Later in the verse, the MT has את-יואב, while a few LXX manuscripts have the expected אל. RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher*, 142 and KB (p. 1035) read את in the MT as signifying a preposition ("bei") with the Niphal of תעב.

⁽³²⁾ 1 Chr 21,7. I read with the MT הנה ויך. The Syriac has 'l dmn' dwyd (= על-אשר ספר דויד).

any wrongdoing (2 Chr 21,8)⁽³³⁾. Warned by Joab that his census would bring guilt upon Israel, David requires an overt display of divine displeasure against Israel to realize his error.

II. David as Confessor and Intercessor

When the Chronicler's deletions and additions are considered in conjunction with what the Chronicler retains from his *Vorlage*, the portrait of David as confessor, negotiator, and intercessor is apparent. The Chronicler, like the author of Samuel, has David openly confess his guilt and request that YHWH remit his misdeed (2 Sam 24,10; 1 Chr 21,8). David is not passive. Unlike Saul, who dies in his rebellion (1 Chr 10,13-14), and Ahaz, who repeatedly and stubbornly compounds his guilt (2 Chronicles 28), David is immediately repentant. He does not attempt to shift the blame to others. In accordance with the Psalmist's admonition not to ignore one's transgression (Ps 32,3-5), David confronts the consequences of his actions. To be sure, Samuel and Chronicles present David in great distress (2 Sam 24,14; 1 Chr 21,13), but both texts also present David as an astute participant in the negotiations that determine his fate (2 Sam 24,11-13; 1 Chr 21,9-13).

The punishments described by Gad — three years of famine, three months of subjugation by enemies, three days of pestilence — underscore David's national importance⁽³⁴⁾. Indeed, the collective nature of these penalties reflects a cardinal tenet of ancient Near Eastern royal ideology, that a people may experience weal or woe, contingent upon the standing of its king with the divine realm⁽³⁵⁾. If Israel earlier benefited from its election of David to be its king,

⁽³³⁾ David's admission to "this thing" (הדבר הזה) alludes to the offense mentioned in the previous verse: "this thing" (הדבר הזה; 2 Chr 21,7), suggesting that the census is improper, BAILEY, "David's Innocence", 88-89. In 2 Chr 21,17 the same point recurs: David unambiguously reaffirms that he alone is to blame for the calamity that has befallen his people and threatens to befall Jerusalem.

⁽³⁴⁾ The divine command to Gad is elliptical. The punishments are not fully described until Gad communicates with David, M. STERNBERG, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature; Bloomington, IN 1987) 384.

⁽³⁵⁾ See my "Dissonance and Disaster in the Legend of Kirta", *JAOS* 114 (1994) 572-582 and the references listed there.

Israel now suffers for his error. Of the three choices, David chooses pestilence, because he would rather fall into the hands of YHWH than into the hands of humans⁽³⁶⁾. David's reasoning for choosing a divinely administered penalty, that YHWH's "compassion is exceedingly great", is well-founded⁽³⁷⁾. Unbeknownst to David, YHWH halts the killing spree of his messenger against Israel before that messenger attacks Jerusalem⁽³⁸⁾. Like David, YHWH repents (נחם) of evil (1 Chr 21,15; 2 Sam 24,16).

Because David is unaware of YHWH's change of mind, he proceeds under the assumption that Jerusalem is the next target of the divine agent's wrath⁽³⁹⁾. Even with the repentance of YHWH, it is not entirely clear, as some commentators have supposed, that the threat to Jerusalem has completely passed. In Chronicles, 4QSam^a, and Josephus, David witnesses YHWH's envoy with an ansheathed sword, perched between heaven and earth, in a menacing pose against Jerusalem⁽⁴⁰⁾. It is no wonder that David and the elders, dressed in sackcloth, fall on their faces (1 Chr 21,16)⁽⁴¹⁾. In the

⁽³⁶⁾ The Chronicler stresses the choice between human punishment and divine punishment (1 Chr 21,12; cf. 2 Sam 24,13), R. MICHEEL, *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik* (BBET 18; Frankfurt am Main 1983) 22-23. That Israel, and not David himself, directly suffers for David's crime is debated in b. *Yoma* 22b.

⁽³⁷⁾ MT 1 Chr 21,13. The LXX^B has $\delta\tau\iota\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \omicron\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\rho\mu\omicron\iota\ \sigma\phi\acute{o}\delta\rho\alpha$. 2 Sam 24,14 simply reads $\text{כִּי־רַבִּים דָּחֲמוּ}$.

⁽³⁸⁾ On the angel's drawn sword, see Num 22,22.31; Josh 5,13-15, and the discussion of MOSIS, *Untersuchungen*, 115-116.

⁽³⁹⁾ Those who would either excise 1 Chr 21,26-22,1 as a later gloss or view the information provided in these verses as incidental to the progress of the story underestimate the importance of the different roles played by the characters in this narrative, contra G. VON RAD, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* (Stuttgart 1930) 101; WILLI, *Auslegung*, 174. The reader is informed that YHWH constrained the activities of his messenger (1 Chr 21,8), but there is no indication that David knows anything whatsoever about this development. From David's perspective, the threat remains until YHWH tells his messenger to sheath his sword (1 Chr 21,27). In Chronicles there are two stages in the cessation of the pestilence, ROFÉ, "4QSam^a", 114-115.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ 1 Chr 21,16; 4QSam^a; Josephus, *Ant.* VII.327. ULRICH, *Qumran*, 156-157 and McCARTER, *II Samuel*, 506-507, argue, in fact, that this notice was lost to the MT tradition of 2 Sam 24,16 by haplography (*homoioarkton*) from וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד at the beginning of v. 17.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Again, given the witness of 4QSam^a (ULRICH, *Qumran*, 156-157), these details may have been in the Chronicler's *Vorlage*.

context of this apparent threat to the population of Jerusalem, one finds David again interceding with God, pleading with him to reconsider his plan of destruction. Like the plaintiff of Psalm 51,5, who confesses, "I know of my rebellions, my sin is continually before me", David reaffirms that he committed the crime. But he also questions the punishment. In both Samuel and Chronicles David implores YHWH to vent his wrath against the perpetrator (David) and not against the innocent populace of Jerusalem⁽⁴²⁾. Along with the authors of Deuteronomy⁽⁴³⁾, Jeremiah (31,28-30), Ezekiel (18; 33,12-20), David makes a case for limiting the scope of divinely administered punishment of humans to the guilty parties themselves. Or, if vicarious punishment is to characterize divine-human relations, suffering for the sins of others should be limited to the members of one's family⁽⁴⁴⁾. Hence, in this case, the king ingeniously requests that he not be considered above the law, but in accordance with it⁽⁴⁵⁾.

⁽⁴²⁾ The grounds for David's appeal (2 Sam 24,17; 1 Chr 21,17) resonate with the Chronicler's standard of justice, somewhat simplistically called his "theology of immediate retribution". See J. WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Edinburgh 1885) 203-210; JAPHET, *Ideology*, 150-176; R. B. DILLARD, "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution", *WTJ* 46 (1984) 164-172; R. L. BRAUN, "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28 and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles", *JBL* 95 (1974) 581-590; E. BEN ZVI, "A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Theology of the Chronicler", *SJOT* 9 (1995) 37-51.

⁽⁴³⁾ Deut 7,9-10 is a good example. This *traditio* cites the portion of the Decalogue dealing with the transgenerational consequences of sin (Exod 20,4-6 // Deut 5,8-10) only to transform this *traditum* into an assertion that YHWH punishes those who hate him instantly, B. M. LEVINSON, "The human voice in divine revelation: The problem of authority in Biblical law", *Innovation in Religious Traditions* (ed. M. A. WILLIAMS – C. COX – M. S. JAFFEE) (Religion and Society 31; Berlin 1992) 46-61. Deuteronomy also includes a declaration that a person will only be put to death for his own crime (24,16).

⁽⁴⁴⁾ 2 Sam 24,17; 1 Chr 21,17. David's attempt to deflect divine retaliation away from the people onto himself and his family is generally in line with the divine pronouncement on vicarious punishment in Exodus 34,6-7 (cf. Exod. 20,4-6). On the prophetic interrogation and nullification of vicarious punishment in divine-human affairs, see M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 335-341.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ See Deut 17,14-20 and esp. 1 Sam 12,14-25.

But there is also a contrast between Samuel and Chronicles in the grounds of David's appeal. The contrite David of Chronicles is even more explicit about his responsibility than the David of Samuel. In MT Samuel David confesses, "I have sinned and I have acted wickedly" (הנה אנכי הטאתי ואנכי הערתי) ⁽⁴⁶⁾. But in Chronicles David's plea to YHWH on behalf of his people is more pointed. David reminds God that it was he (David) who issued the command to number Israel and that it was he (David) who "sinned and did great evil" (ואני־הוא אשר־הטאתי והרע הרעותי) ⁽⁴⁷⁾. David proposes to attenuate the negative effects that the king as a nexus between the heavenly and earthly realms can have on the fate of his people ⁽⁴⁸⁾. In Chronicles, even more so than in Samuel, David acts to mitigate the effects of divine wrath upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

III. Renewed Obedience

If the Chronicler accentuates David's responsibility for the census and his intercession on behalf of his people, he also accentuates David's diligence in following the direction of the divine messenger. Both Samuel and Chronicles depict David demanding repeatedly to pay for the threshing floor, the oxen, and the wood so that he might avert the outbreak of a plague among the people of Jerusalem ⁽⁴⁹⁾. But, as Williamson and Zakovitch have shown, the terminology used to describe David's purchase of land in Jerusalem in 1 Chr 21,22-25, even more so than in 2 Sam 24,22-24, replicates the terminology used to describe Abraham's purchase of the cave of

⁽⁴⁶⁾ 2 Sam 24,17. Again, 4QSam^a is closer to the MT of Chronicles, [א]נכי הרעה הרעתי, "I the shepherd did evil" (cf. LXX^L, OL, Josephus, *Ant.* VII.328). McCarter thinks that הרעה was lost to MT Samuel and that an original הרעתי became הערתי through confusion between *reš* and *waw* and the occurrence of metathesis, *II Samuel*, 507. But Rofé argues that the MT of 2 Sam 24,17 assimilates toward the formula found in 1 Kgs 8,47 (cf. Ps 106,6; Job 33,27; Dan 9,5), "4QSam^a", 118.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ 1 Chr 21,17. I read with the MT. The LXX^B has καὶ ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ἁμαρτῶν (LXX^L adds καὶ) κακοποιῶν ἐκακοποίησα. It is unclear whether, as ALLEN, *Greek Chronicles*, I, 50 argues, the LXX^B translator is using the participle to paraphrase his Hebrew *Vorlage*.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ 1 Chr 21,17 reads in part תהי נא ירך בי ובבית אבי ובעמך לא למגפה, whereas 2 Sam 24,17 simply has תהי נא ירך בי ובבית אבי.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ 1 Chr 21,22,24; cf. 2 Sam 24,21,24.

Machpelah (Gen 23,8-20)⁽⁵⁰⁾. In purchasing the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite, David, no less than Abraham before him, must own the property before he can carry out his obligation⁽⁵¹⁾. Like Abraham negotiating with the Hittite Ephron for the Cave of Machpelah, the Chronicler's David repeatedly insists that he pay full price for the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite⁽⁵²⁾. And the full price David disburses to offer burnt offerings at this site — 600 shekels of gold — dwarfs the price paid by either the David of Samuel (50 shekels of silver) or the Abraham of Genesis (400 shekels of silver; Gen 23,15-16). The exorbitant payment for the threshing floor highlights the significance a conscientious David ascribes to securing this site⁽⁵³⁾.

We have seen that the authors of both Samuel and Chronicles, consistent with tenets of ancient Near royal ideology, portray disaster upon the body politic as the consequence of David's sin. The Chronicler, however, seizes upon the national implications of David's misdeed to demonstrate the national implications of David's intercession and obedience. The Chronicler construes the mandate to construct an altar at this particular location not as an *ad hominem* emergency maneuver to avert divine wrath, but as a decisive turning point in the history of Israelite religion⁽⁵⁴⁾. That the Chronicler

⁽⁵⁰⁾ WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 149-150; Y. ZAKOVITCH, "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives", *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J.H. TIGAY) (Philadelphia 1985) 181. I use the term replicate, rather than assimilate, because the similarities between 1 Chr 21,22-25 and Gen 23,8-20 seem to result from authorial (and not scribal) activity. Genesis 23 is usually ascribed to the Priestly writers, M. NOTH, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Chico, CA 1981) 11, 110; C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 12-36* (Minneapolis 1985) 371-372. There are also some parallels between David's encounter with Ornan and the meeting between the divine messenger and Gideon at Ophrah (Jud 6,11-24), WILLI, *Auslegung*, 157.

⁽⁵¹⁾ This furnishes Abraham with legal right to the land (WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*, 185), but the narrative does not explain why the matter is of such urgency for Abraham. According to von Rad, landless Abraham, a sojourner (גר-זר; Gen 23,4), secures a small downpayment on the divine promise of the land (Gen 23,20), *Genesis*, rev. ed. (OTL; Philadelphia 1972) 245-250. But according to WESTERMANN, *Genesis 12-36*, 376, legal acquisition of land is necessary to a proper burial for P.

⁽⁵²⁾ The phrase כסף מלא is found only in 1 Chr 21,22, 24 and Gen 23,39 (cf. מדהיר; 2 Sam 24,24), WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 149.

⁽⁵³⁾ Fifty shekels of gold for each of the twelve tribes of Israel (Rashi).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ How much the story in Samuel functions in a similar way is

considers the altar as a permanent fixture in Israel's national cult is apparent at the end of his narrative, but there is a hint of this already earlier⁽⁵⁵⁾. In the Chronicler's version of the negotiations between David and Ornan that follow, David repeatedly refers to the threshing floor as a מִקְדָּשׁ (1 Chr 21,22.25), a term that in certain contexts can designate a sacred precinct or sanctuary⁽⁵⁶⁾. The choice of terminology does not seem to be accidental. In the introduction to his description of Solomon's construction of the temple, the Chronicler avers that Solomon built this edifice on Mt. Moriah, the place (מִקְדָּשׁ) where YHWH appeared to David at the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite (1 Chr 3,1)⁽⁵⁷⁾.

IV. Divine Forgiveness and Blessing

The Chronicler's version of the divine acceptance of David's offerings confirm David's altar as an enduring fixture in the Israelite cult⁽⁵⁸⁾. The contrasts with the account in Samuel are startling.

debated. H. W. Hertzberg, for example, describes the Samuel story as the *Hieros Logos* of the Jerusalem temple cult, *I & II Samuel* (OTL; Philadelphia 1964) 410-411. But the connections between the threshing floor and the future site of the temple are not made explicit in the Samuel text itself, WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*, 178-180.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ The divine authorization for the altar is more explicit in Chronicles than in 2 Sam 24,18. In Samuel Gad simply tells David to establish an altar for YHWH at the threshing floor, but in 1 Chr 21,18 the messenger of YHWH tells Gad to inform David that David should construct an altar.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Both in Hebrew (e.g., Deut 12,5-11.14.18.21.26; 14,23.24.25; 15,20; Josh 9,27) and in Phoenician, R. S. TOMBACK, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (SBLDS 32; Missoula, MT 1978) 195-196. See also A. C. WELCH, *The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Date* (The Schweich Lectures 1938; London 1939) 24; WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 149-150.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ *Tg. Ket.* 1 Chr 21,15 makes the connection with Genesis 22 explicit. On the connection between 2 Chr 3,1 and the Aqeda, see I. KALIMI, "The Land of Moriah, Mount Moriah, and the Site of Solomon's Temple in Biblical Historiography", *HTR* 83 (1990) 345-362.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Along with R. Kittel, I regard 2 Chr 21,28-30 as a later addition, *Die Bücher der Chronik und Esra, Nehemia und Esther* (HAT 1/6; Göttingen 1902) 79-81. In my judgment, the technique used to interpolate the additional material in vv. 28-30 is Zeidel's Law; see M. ZEIDEL, "Parallels between Isaiah and Psalms (Hebrew)", *Sinai* 38 (1955-1956) 149-172, 229-240, 272-280, 335-355. The writer reuses phraseology from vv. 26-27 to

After depicting David's sacrifice of burnt offerings and offerings of well-being, the author of Samuel states that YHWH accepted David's "supplication for the land" (2 Sam 24,25). This notice ends the narrative in Samuel, because the altar has served its purpose; "the plague was averted from Israel" (2 Sam 24,25). To be sure, the offerings on the altar also end the threat of divine wrath in Chronicles. YHWH tells his messenger to sheath his sword (1 Chr 21,27); the peril to Jerusalem has passed.

But in Chronicles the divine response also serves a much more important long-range objective in divine-human relations. The impressive divine reaction to David's offerings, as interpreted by David, resolves a dualism in the national cultus, an anomalous bifurcation in the practice of Israelite worship that had existed since the elevation of the ark into Jerusalem. In Chronicles the much-celebrated arrival of the ark establishes Jerusalem as a national shrine (1 Chr 16,1), but it also leaves Israel with two major official sanctuaries — Jerusalem and Gibeon. While the ark of YHWH is attended by the Levitical services of praise in Jerusalem (1 Chr 16,37-38), the tabernacle (משכן) of YHWH resides in Gibeon, attended by Zadok and his kin (1 Chr 16,39)⁽⁵⁹⁾. Each of these cult

frame his own addition. 1 Chr 21,28 refers to 1 Chr 21,26, but reformulates its terms in basically reverse order:

26a) ויבן שם דויד מזבֿח ליהוה	28b) ויזבח שם
26b) ויקרא אל־יהוה ויענהו	28a) כִּי־ענהו יהוה

Having modelled his explanation on the description of Solomon's journey to Gibeon (2 Chr 1,3-6), he returns his readers to the original narrative at the end of v.30 by referring to the events of v.27 (again) in basically reverse order:

27a) ויאמר יהוה	30c) יהוה
27b) למלאך	30b) מלאך
27c) וישב חרבו אל־נדבֿה	30a) כי גבעת מפני חרב

In my judgment, this material is not parenthetical within the Chronicler's own composition, because its content conflicts with the force of 1 Chr 21,26-27; 2 Chr 22,1 (*pace* CURTIS – MADSEN, *Chronicles*, 254; RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher*, 148; DION, "Angel with the Drawn Sword", 114-117; JAPHET, *Ideology*, 141-142; WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 150-151). The author of 1 Chr 21,28-30 draws on material in 1 Chr 21,26-27 and 2 Chr 1,3-6 to excuse David's offering sacrifice away from the tabernacle altar. But David is explicitly commanded to do so (1 Chr 21,18). Not the Chronicler, but a later scribe is bothered by the story's evidence for divinely approved worship away from the Gibeon altar (see further below).

⁽⁵⁹⁾ The Chronicler is likely drawing upon the notice of 1 Kgs 3,4 (cf. 2 Chr 1,3-6), in which the Deuteronomist explains Solomon's journey to Gibeon; see my *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of*

centers, the Chronicler observes, is associated with its own complement of ritual trappings. When the ark is placed in the tent, burnt offerings and offerings of well-being are sacrificed before God⁽⁶⁰⁾. David, in turn, blesses the people and commissions some of the Levites to serve regularly before the ark (1 Chr 16,2-6). David appoints (נָתַן) Asaph and his kin to take the lead in praising YHWH and even provides them with a psalm to sing (1 Chr 16,8-35)⁽⁶¹⁾.

As for the sacred precinct at Gibeon, Zadok and his priests sacrifice burnt offerings to YHWH there daily upon the altar⁽⁶²⁾. Like the newly dedicated ministry of praise associated with the ark in Jerusalem, the Gibeon cult has its own coterie of singers and musicians, authorized to praise YHWH (1 Chr 16,42). The Chronicler does not deem the Gibeon shrine to be inherently illicit. He comments, in fact, that the sacrifices performed there accorded with "all what was written in the torah of YHWH" (1 Chr 16,42). But in the Chronicler's ideology of a unified national cult, which draws upon both Deuteronomic and Priestly materials, the ark and the tabernacle belong together. Given the Deuteronomic mandate for one central sanctuary, the existence of two national shrines can only be temporary. It is this situation that David's obedience and YHWH's dramatic intervention resolve.

Only in Chronicles does David both sacrifice burnt offerings, offerings of well-being, and call upon YHWH (וַיִּקְרָא אֶל־יְהוָה; 1 Chr 21,26)⁽⁶³⁾. And only in Chronicles does YHWH answer David's

Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, 1: *The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam* (HSM 52; Atlanta 1993) 77-82. But the Chronicler anticipates and justifies this feature of Solomon's reign in his description of David's cultic innovations.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ The subject is unclear. 1 Chr 16,1 consistently has the plural. The nearest antecedent is Israel in 1 Chr 15,28. In the parallel (2 Sam 6,16-17) David is consistently the subject. To complicate matters further, 1 Chr 16,2 mentions that David "completed offering the burnt offering and the offerings of well-being". This may be a case in which the Chronicler is adapting material from his *Vorlage* to underscore the participation of both king and people in a national festal occasion.

⁽⁶¹⁾ Largely a medley of excerpts from Psalms 105,1-15; 96,1-13 and 106,47-48.

⁽⁶²⁾ 1 Chr 16,40-41. I see no compelling reason to excise these verses as a later addition, *pace* WELCH, *Work*, 31-32.

⁽⁶³⁾ One is tempted to say that the Chronicler's David observes the deuteronomistic mandate to invoke YHWH at his chosen place. In Deuteronomistic terms, the central sanctuary bears YHWH's name and one

burnt offerings, of well-being, and invocation by sending fire from heaven upon the altar of the burnt offering (1 Chr 21,26). The imagery is, of course, highly significant. In portraying this miraculous divine affirmation of David's altar, the Chronicler draws upon the divine response to the institution of the tabernacle altar in the Priestly Code. When Aaron and his sons use the tabernacle altar for the first time, "fire came forth from before YHWH and consumed the burnt offering and the fatty portions upon the altar" (Lev 9,24)⁽⁶⁴⁾. By sanctioning the altar built at the threshing floor of Ornan in a similar way to his sanctioning of the tabernacle altar, YHWH publicly designated this place (מקום) as a new sacred precinct.

David seizes upon the divine action⁽⁶⁵⁾. He declares the site to be the home of the future temple; "this shall be the house of the LORD God and this shall be the altar for the burnt offering of Israel"⁽⁶⁶⁾. In consistently employing the singular, David implies that the Jerusalem altar and sanctuary will supercede all previous altars and sanctuaries⁽⁶⁷⁾. David immediately begins to gather workers and materials for the construction of the temple (2 Chr 22,2-4)⁽⁶⁸⁾. He also begins to prepare his son for the construction of

is to call upon him there (1 Kgs 8,43 [//2Chr 6,33]. 52; 2 Kgs 20,11; Jer 7,10.11.14.30; 32,34; 34,15 [all Jer C]); see M. WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford 1972) 325. But the expression, קרא אל-יהוה, is ubiquitous in the Hebrew scriptures as an act of piety (e.g., Judg 16,28; 1 Kgs 17,20; Isa 55,6; 58,9; Joel 1,14; Ps 4,1.3; 18,4.7; 86,3.5.7; 2 Chr 14,10; cf. Isa 64,7; Ps 14,4; 79,6).

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Lev 9,24; 1 Kgs 18,37-38. B. A. Levine argues that the fire in Lev 9,24 stemmed from inside the tent of meeting, *Leviticus* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia 1989) 55-58. For the use of divine fire in a negative sense, see Lev 10,2 and Num 16,35, J. MILGROM, *Numbers* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia 1990) 136-139.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ The site is chosen by YHWH (WILLI, *Auslegung*, 218; P. R. ACKROYD, *The Chronicler in His Age* [JSOTSS 101; Sheffield 1991] 268-269; NOTH, *The Chronicler's*, 94), but David pronounces it the site of the future temple, WRIGHT, "Innocence", 103.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ 1 Chr 22,1; cf. 2 Chr 2,2-4; 13,11-12.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ The Chronicler, more so than the Deuteronomist, maintains a consistent interest in the fate of the Jerusalem altar (2 Chr 4,1.19; 5,12; 6,12.22; 7,7.9; 8,12; 15,8; 23,10; 29,18-21; 32,12; 35,16). The close connection between David's altar and the temple is stressed in a fragmentary text from Qumran, E. PUECH, "La pierre de Sion et l'autel des holocaustes d'après un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte 4 (4Q522) (*Planche XIX*)", *RB* 99 (1992) 676-696.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ The link between the verses (1 Chr 21,28-22,1) depicting the ratifi-

the central sanctuary, describing its purpose in glowing terms (2 Chr 22,5-6). The rest of David's reign in Chronicles, in fact, consists of preparing for the construction of the temple and establishing an elaborate national administration to assist his chosen successor, Solomon (1 Chronicles 22-29)⁽⁶⁹⁾. Just as YHWH provided Moses with a plan (תבנית) for the tabernacle, David provides Solomon with a plan (תבנית) for the central sanctuary⁽⁷⁰⁾. It will only be a matter of time before the tabernacle will be brought to Jerusalem from Gibeon to find its place in the temple. That the central sanctuary simultaneously incorporates and succeeds previous cultic arrangements is emphasized in the Chronicler's depiction of Solomon's temple dedication⁽⁷¹⁾. After the ark of the covenant and the tent of meeting are brought into the temple and Solomon utters his dedicatory prayers, divine intervention occurs again: "The fire from heaven consumed the burnt offering as well as the sacrifices and the glory (כבוד) of YHWH filled the house" (2 Chr 7,1).

Conclusion

Mays comments that the David of classical Judaism and early Christianity is both more than and different from the David of the Hebrew Bible⁽⁷²⁾. That this is so is not surprising. Despite some

cation of David's altar and those depicting preparations for the temple (1 Chr 22,5ff.) leads De Vries to consider these verses as all part of one continuous narrative, *Chronicles*, 180.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ I view most of 1 Chronicles 23-27 as an integral part of the Chronicler's work; see JAPHET, *Ideology*, 116-136 and J.W. WRIGHT, "The Legacy of David in Chronicles: The Narrative Function of 1 Chronicles 23-27", *JBL* 110 (1991) 229-242.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ 1 Chr 28,11.18.29; cf. Exod 25,9.40. See further S.J. DE VRIES, "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles", *JBL* 107 (1988) 619-639.

⁽⁷¹⁾ The Josianic Deuteronomist views the temple similarly, KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God*, I, 112-122. But the Chronicler's presentation of the events preceding the temple dedication is even more stylized, P. WELTEN, "Lade-Tempel-Jerusalem: zur Theologie der Chronikbücher", *Textgemäß: Aufsätze und Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des alten Testaments* (ed. A. GUNNEWEG – O. KAISER) (Göttingen 1979) 169-183.

⁽⁷²⁾ J.L. MAYS, "The David of the Psalms", *Int* 40 (1986) 154. The same can be said for early Islam. In the Qur'ān David appears as an exemplary penitent (s. 38.10-27) and as representative of Judaism, alongside Jesus as representative of Christianity (s. 5.78).

important areas of agreement, there are fundamental differences between early Jewish and Christian interpreters and the methods they use to understand the Hebrew scriptures⁽⁷³⁾. Each draws upon and develops traditions about David in its own distinctive way. Moreover, the Hebrew scriptures themselves do not speak about David with one voice. There are, as many commentators have stressed, multiple images of David within the Hebrew Bible: shepherd, warrior, musician, administrator, lyricist, politician, singer, sinner, king, husband, paramour, and father. Given this diversity, it is only to be expected that later interpreters concentrated upon certain aspects of David's reputation and neglected others.

Writing toward the end of the biblical period, the Chronicler was himself an early interpreter who was likely familiar with many, if not all, of the aforementioned representations of David. Considering the multiple images of David available to the Chronicler, it would be startling to see him fixate upon one. Yet this is what some commentators have claimed. Of the many disparate biblical portraits of David, the Chronicler's presentation has been associated, not always approvingly, with that of David as cult-founder. Wellhausen, for instance, claims:

See what Chronicles has made of David! The founder of the kingdom has become the founder of the temple and the public worship, the king and hero at the head of his companions has become the singer and master of ceremonies at the head of a swarm of priests and Levites; his clearly cut figure has become a feeble holy picture, seen through a cloud of incense⁽⁷⁴⁾.

Such a one-sided presentation of David's significance can be easily qualified by recognizing the martial, dynastic, administrative, and

⁽⁷³⁾ A. ROSNER, *David's Leben und Charakter nach Talmud und Midrash* (Oldenburg i. Gr. 1908); J.L. KUGEL – R.A. GREER, *Early Biblical Interpretation* (Library of Early Christianity 3; Philadelphia 1986); J.L. KUGEL, "Topics in the History of the Spirituality of the Psalms", *Jewish Spirituality From the Bible Through the Middle Ages* (ed. A. GREEN) (New York 1988) 133-135; J.M. BASSLER, "David in Rabbinic and New Testament Literature", *Int* 40 (1986) 156-169; D.L. PETERSEN, "Portraits of David: Canonical and Otherwise", *Int* 40 (1986) 130-142; H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalms 1-59* (Minneapolis 1988) 16-32; U. SIMON, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra* (Albany, NY 1991); MILLER, *They Cried to the Lord*, 304-335.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ *Prolegomena*, 182.

political aspects of David's leadership in 1 Chronicles 11–29⁽⁷⁵⁾. David is, of course, a cult-founder in Chronicles⁽⁷⁶⁾. But David's establishment and structuring of worship in Jerusalem is only one, albeit a very important, aspect of his reputation.

In this essay, we have seen that there are compelling reasons to recognize an additional dimension of David's legacy in Chronicles. The image of David as the model of a repentant sinner is a constituent element in the Chronicler's depiction of David. The David of the census story is a person of confession and supplication *par excellence*, a human sinner who repents, seeks forgiveness, intercedes on behalf of his people, and ultimately secures the site of the future temple. Precisely because David is a pivotal figure in the Chronicler's History of Israel, David's repentance and intercession are paradigmatic⁽⁷⁷⁾. The Chronicler's conviction that errant Israelites have both the opportunity to reform and the potential to make new contributions to their nation is evident in the reigns of Rehoboam (2 Chr 12,5-12), Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 19,1-11), Amaziah (2 Chr 25,5-13), and even Manasseh (2 Chr 33,10-17)⁽⁷⁸⁾. But this principle is formatively and preeminently at work in the career of David. In the context of a national disaster of his own making, David is able to turn that catastrophe into the occasion for a permanent divine blessing upon Israel. 1 Chronicles 21 is an example

(75) R. NORTH, "Theology of the Chronicler", *JBL* 82 (1963) 369-381; JAPHET, *Ideology*, 445-491; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, "Eschatology in Chronicles", *TynB* 28 (1977) 115-154; J.W. WRIGHT, "Guarding the Gates: 1 Chronicles 26.1-19 and the Roles of Gatekeepers in Chronicles", *JSOT* 48 (1990) 69-81; id., "Legacy", 229-242; R.H. LOWERY, *The Reforming Kings: Cult and Society in First Temple Judah* (JSOTSS 120; Sheffield 1991); G.N. KNOPPERS, "The History of Royal Reforms", *The Chronicler as Historian* (ed. M.P. GRAHAM et al.) (Sheffield forthcoming).

(76) WELCH, *Work*, 55-96; NORTH, *The Chronicler's History*, 97-106; RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher*, XXI-XIII; MOSIS, *Untersuchungen*, 101-155; MAYS, "David", 149-151; PETERSEN, "Portraits", 141-142; DE VRIES, "Moses and David", 626-639; W. RILEY, *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History* (JSOTSS 160; Sheffield 1993).

(77) A feature of David's legacy that was acknowledged by a variety of early interpreters; Ben Sira 47,11; *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (4Q398 14-17 ii) 25-26; *Midr. Ps.* 3,4; 6,9; 26,2; 51,3; 116,8; *b. 'Abod. Zar.* 4b/5a; *b. Hul* 89a; *b. Yoma* 22b.

(78) JAPHET, *Ideology*, 176-191; G.N. KNOPPERS, "Rehoboam", 432-437; id., "Reform and Regression: The Chronicler's Presentation of Jehoshaphat", *Bib* 72 (1991) 510-516.

of, rather than the exception to, the Chronicler's idealization of David. The Chronicler simply has a broader conception of David's exemplary significance than modern commentators have recognized⁽⁷⁹⁾.

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
USA

Gary N. KNOPPERS

SOMMAIRE

Dans les Chroniques, David est populaire dans toutes les régions d'Israël, victorieux à la guerre, son œuvre culturelle est couronnée de succès, il est expert en politique et zélé quant à l'administration. Étant donné ce portrait hautement stylisé de David, les exégètes se sont étonnés du fait que le Chroniste ait incorporé dans son œuvres le récit du recensement et de la plaie de 2 S 24. Certains attribuent la présence de ce récit dans les Chroniques à un intérêt pour l'exégèse (Willi); d'autres au désir de valider le futur site du temple (DeVries, Duke). D'autres encore voient dans ce récit une preuve que le Chroniste possède les qualités d'un historien de bon aloi (Japhet). Enfin, Wright affirme que David est innocent, mais qu'il accepte le châtement divin pour sauver son royaume.

Mais le problème du caractère sans faille de David a peut-être été mal compris. La culpabilité avouée de David entraîne-t-elle qu'il ne puisse pas servir de modèle aux destinataires postexiliques du Chroniste? Notre étude désire montrer comment le fait que David admette clairement sa culpabilité, qu'il intercède pour Israël, qu'il s'afflige et promette à nouveau obéissance contribue à sa renommée. En d'autres mots, le David du Chroniste est non seulement un héros, un conquérant et un protecteur du culte, il est aussi le pécheur et l'intercesseur des titres des Psaumes.

(79) I delivered an earlier version of this paper at the 1995 annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies. I would like to thank members of this society — especially E. Ben Zvi, D. Jobling, C. Newsom, and K. Parker — for their helpful comments.

Ahabs Buße und die Komposition des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks

1943 hat Martin Noth seine Hypothese des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks vorgetragen⁽¹⁾. Selten hat ein Vorschlag in unserem Fach eine solche Überzeugungskraft ausgeübt. Es gibt heute kaum mehr eine Studie zu den Büchern Dtn-Kön, die nicht auf der Grundlage dieses Theorierahmens argumentiert⁽²⁾, obwohl sich Noths Entwurf rasch als doppelgesichtig herausstellte. So bestechend die formalen Gründe für die ehemalige Existenz dieses Werkes waren, so schwer fiel es, einen einleuchtenden Grund für die außerordentliche Mühe seiner Schaffung zu benennen. Das Werk sollte mit der Zerstörung Jerusalems und deren Folgen geschlossen haben, was im Licht von Schlüsseltexten wie Dtn 28 oder 2 Kön 17 als der endgültige Schlußstrich unter die spezielle Bindung Jhwhs an Israel erscheinen mußte. Deshalb diente das Werk nach Noth der reinen Gerichtsinterpretation. Sein Autor habe "in der Geschichte des Volkes Israel einen in sich geschlossenen Vorgang gesehen, der ... mit der Zerstörung von Jerusalem seinen definitiven Abschluß gefunden hat" ⁽³⁾.

Diese Auslegung war von vornherein fragwürdig. Das DtrG sollte nach masoretischer Zählung ca. 156 Kapitel umfaßt haben⁽⁴⁾, die in BHS grob 350 Seiten füllen — selbst nach heutigen Maßstäben ein Buch von beachtlicher Größe. Wieviel Arbeit und Geld muß es gekostet haben, die Vorlagen zu sammeln und zum

⁽¹⁾ M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Tübingen ³1973).

⁽²⁾ Vgl. z.B. den Literaturbericht von H.D. PREUSS, "Zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk", *TRu* 58 (1993) 229-264, 341-395. Die Existenz des DtrG wird neuerdings bestritten von C. WESTERMANN, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments*. Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk? (Gütersloh 1994).

⁽³⁾ NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 103.

⁽⁴⁾ Nach der Zählung von A.F. CAMPBELL, "Martin Noth and the Deuteronomistic History", *The History of Israel's Traditions. The Heritage of Martin Noth* (ed. St. L. MCKENZIE – M.P. GRAHAM) (JSOTSS 182; Sheffield 1994) 38.

literarischen Endprodukt zu vereinen? Allein die Lektüre des Werkes bzw. seine Rezitation waren zeitraubende Tätigkeiten. All das soll sich abgespielt haben im exilischen Juda, wo man mit einer materiellen Verelendung wird rechnen müssen, die normalerweise andere Prioritäten auferlegte als literarische Interpretationsarbeit großen Stils⁽⁵⁾. Sollte jemand damals eine gewaltige Anstrengung auf sich genommen haben, bloß um die Verzweiflung weiter auf die Spitze zu treiben?

Versuche dagegen, für Noths DtrG doch noch ein zugkräftiges Programm namhaft zu machen, mußten sich auf bescheidene Andeutungen verlassen. Wenn etwa G. von Rad in 2 Kön 25,27-30 einen leisen Hinweis auf die ausstehende Erfüllung der Natanverheißung entdeckte, was "die eigentliche Thematik" des DtrG als "eine messianische" erweise⁽⁶⁾, oder wenn H.W. Wolff Spuren "einer dringlichen Einladung zur Umkehr zu dem Gott der Heilsgeschichte" erblickte⁽⁷⁾, nahmen die Belegtexte doch einen recht unscheinbaren Rang ein oder werden mittlerweile kaum mehr als originale Bestandteile des DtrG akzeptiert.

Einem DtrG in voller Größe von Dtn bis 2 Kön ist also kaum ein Aussageziel zuzuschreiben, das den Aufwand seiner Abfassung unter den Bedingungen der Exilsepoche erklärt. Das führte zu der

(5) Die Beschreibungen der materiellen Lebensverhältnisse im exilischen Juda sind gespalten. Ein mildes Bild zeichnen z. B. H. DONNER, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*. Teil 2 (ATD Ergänzungsreihe 4/2; Göttingen 1986) 387-390 (wobei gerade die mutmaßliche Herkunft des DtrG von dort als Beleg für erträgliche Verhältnisse dient); H. WEIPPERT, *Palästina in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Handbuch der Archäologie, Vorderasien II/1; München 1988) 692; R. ALBERTZ, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*. Teil 2 (ATD Ergänzungsreihe 8/2; Göttingen 1992) 377-379. Ein drastisches Panorama des Niedergangs entwirft aufgrund archäologischer Daten D.W. JAMIESON-DRAKE, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah. A Socio-Archeological Approach* (JSOTSS 109; Sheffield 1991); vgl. insbes. S. 72-76, 145-147 und die Grafiken S. 210-216. Zugleich hebt er den engen Zusammenhang zwischen dem Gebrauch der Schreibkunst und ökonomischen Aktivitäten hervor. Derlei Faktoren können bei Fragen der Datierung und Lokalisierung von Großkompositionen wie dem DtrG nicht unberücksichtigt bleiben.

(6) G. VON RAD, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. I. Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels (München 1958) 342.

(7) H.W. WOLFF, "Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks", *ZAW* 73 (1961) 184; später gefolgt von G. VON RAD, *Theologie I* (München 1969) 358.

Frage, ob der von Noth unterstellte Umfang eine ausgebaute Form repräsentierte, in der die ursprüngliche konzeptionelle Klarheit durch die Aufnahme andersartiger Materialien gelitten hatte. Dann mußte deren Abhebung die originale Architektur wieder freilegen und die Bestimmung der Triebkräfte hinter seiner Entstehung erleichtern, während Noths DtrG als ein Mischprodukt erscheint, von dem nur ein begrenztes Maß an gedanklicher Geschlossenheit erwartet werden kann.

Die Antworten auf die Frage nach älteren Gestalten des DtrG⁽⁸⁾ lassen sich in zwei Grundtypen ordnen. Nach dem von R. Smend angeregten Schichtenmodell⁽⁹⁾ steht am Beginn eine Urfassung (DtrH), die schon bis 2 Kön 25 reichte und durch mehrere, aber immer dtr Bearbeitungsschichten (DtrP, DtrN) zu Noths Endprodukt answoll⁽¹⁰⁾. Die einschlägige Analyse der Königsbücher stammt von W. Dietrich. DtrH aus frühexilischer Zeit habe mit 2 Kön 25,21 eine "Ätiologie des Nullpunkts" abgeschlossen, die eine "rückhaltlose Hinwendung zu Jahwe" bewirken sollte⁽¹¹⁾. Freilich bleiben

⁽⁸⁾ Vgl. als jüngste Frucht der Diskussion den Sammelband von MCKENZIE und GRAHAM (Anm. 4).

⁽⁹⁾ Vgl. H. WEIPPERT, "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk. Sein Ziel und Ende in der neueren Forschung", *TRu* 50 (1985) 213-249.

⁽¹⁰⁾ R. SMEND, "Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte", *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (FS. G. VON RAD; [Hrsg. H. W. WOLFF] München 1971) 494-509; dazu die Ausgestaltung der Theorie v. a. durch W. DIETRICH, *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 109; Göttingen 1972); T. VEJOLA, *Die ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 193; Helsinki 1975); DERS., *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 198; Helsinki 1978); C. LEVIN, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja. Ein Kapitel zur Geschichte Judas im 9. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (SBS 105; Stuttgart 1982); H. SPIECKERMANN, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (FRLANT 129; Göttingen 1982); R. STAHL, *Aspekte der Geschichte deuteronomistischer Theologie. Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Terminologie und zur Redaktionsgeschichte der Redekompositionen* (Masch. Habilschr. Jena [1982]); E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Die Bücher der Könige*. Kap. 1-16 (ATD 11/1; Göttingen-Zürich 1985), 1. Kön. 17-2. Kön. 25 (ATD 11/2; Göttingen 1984); L. CAMP, *Hiskija und Hiskijabild. Analyse und Interpretation von 2 Kön 18-20* (Münsteraner Theologische Abhandlungen 9; Altenberge 1989).

⁽¹¹⁾ DIETRICH, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 141. "DtrH" hieß bei DIETRICH noch "DtrG".

damit trotz einschneidender Literarkritik die Probleme bestehen, die schon die Thesen von M. Noth und H.W. Wolff belasteten. Deshalb und wegen der oft schmalen Indizienbasis ist es mittlerweile um diesen Lösungsweg stiller geworden. Die folgenden Überlegungen werden auch gerade einen wichtigen Baustein dieser Hypothese — den “prophetischen Deuteronomisten” (DtrP) — in Zweifel ziehen.

Nach dem Blockmodell dagegen wurde eine kürzere, vorexilische Urfassung nachträglich auf den Endstand ausgedehnt, wobei auch im älteren Bestand gewisse Anpassungen stattfanden. Solche Hypothesen sind heute meist Varianten der Theorie von F.M. Cross, das DtrG* sei unter Joschija entstanden und habe ehemals von Dtn 1 bis 2 Kön 23,25b⁽¹²⁾ (abzüglich jüngerer Zusätze) gereicht⁽¹³⁾. Dieser Pfad erscheint vielversprechend, weil für eine Schichtengrenze an dieser Stelle brauchbare Indizien sprechen⁽¹⁴⁾, viele Züge des Werkes gut zur Zeit Joschijas passen und die Entstehung des DtrG* als propagandistische Begleitung seiner Maßnahmen leicht erklärlich ist⁽¹⁵⁾.

⁽¹²⁾ Zur Satzsegmentierung des *MT* vgl. W. RICHTER, *Biblia Hebraica transcripta. BH¹⁶. 6. 1 und 2 Könige* (ATSAT 33.6; St. Ottilien 1991). Lediglich werden hier Relativsätze separat markiert (daher 23,25b = 23,25aR bei RICHTER).

⁽¹³⁾ F. M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973) 274-289. Vgl. schon A. KUENEN, *Historisch-kritisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds. 1. Het ontstaan van de Historische Boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (Leiden 1861) 263-268.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Vgl. G. VANONI, “Beobachtungen zur deuteronomistischen Terminologie in 2 Kön 23,25–25,30”, *Das Deuteronomium. Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (Hrsg. N. LOHFINK) (BETL 68; Leuven 1985) 357-362.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Vgl. zuletzt I. W. PROVAN, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings. A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 172; Berlin - New York 1988); M. A. O'BRIEN, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Freiburg Schweiz - Göttingen 1989); B. HALPERN – D. VANDERHOOF, “The Editions of Kings in the 7th-6th Centuries B.C.E.”, *HUCA* 62 (1991) 179-244; St. L. MCKENZIE, *The Trouble with Kings. The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTS 42; Leiden 1991); A. MOENIKES, “Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des sogenannten Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks”, *ZAW* 104 (1992) 333-348; G. N. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God. The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*, Vol. 1: The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam (HSM 52; Atlanta, Ga. 1993); Vol. 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of

Die erwartungsgemäße konzeptionelle Transparenz wird so durch die Identifikation sekundärer Erweiterungen zu erreichen gesucht. In diese Debatte reiht sich auch die vorliegende Studie ein. Ihr geht es um eine Textgruppe, in der wiederholt jüngere Zuwächse zum DtrG postuliert wurden, nämlich die Prophetenerzählungen⁽¹⁶⁾ in 1 Kön 13–2 Kön 13⁽¹⁷⁾, und näherhin um einen Passus, auf den sich solche Urteile unter anderem stützen: die Notiz von Ahabs Buße und Strafaufschub in 1 Kön 21,27–29. Die Nachfrage gilt ihrer Funktion im geschichtstheologischen Konzept des DtrG und ihrem Zeugniswert für den Werdegang des Werkes.

I. Hinweise auf sekundäre Auffüllung des DtrG durch Prophetenerzählungen in den Königsbüchern

Der genannte Bereich enthält Indizien, wonach bestimmte Prophetenerzählungen erst nachträglich ins DtrG eingegangen sind. Dazu zählt ein oft hervorgehobener Tatbestand allerdings nicht: Die fraglichen Geschichten sind überwiegend frei von dtr Einflüssen. Im Interesse einer soliden Argumentation ist festzuhalten, daß sich Schlüsse auf nachträglichen Einbau nicht auf mangelnde dtr Prägung berufen können. Denn auch sonst haben die Schöpfer des

Israel, and the Reign of Josiah (HSM 53; Atlanta, Ga. 1994). — Eine Kreuzung aus Block- und Schichtenmodell vertritt E. WÜRTHEIN, "Erwägungen zum sog. deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk. Eine Skizze"; DERS., *Studien zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (BZAW 227; Berlin-New York 1994) 1–11. C. HARDMEIER, "Umriss eines vordeuteronomistischen Annalenwerks der Zidkijazeit. Zu den Möglichkeiten computergestützter Textanalyse", *VT* 40 (1990) 165–184, bestreitet eine vorexilische Ausgabe des DtrG.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Der Terminus wird hier zwecks rascher Verständigung in unscharfer Weise auch auf solche Geschichten angewandt, wo der Protagonist keinen Nabi-Titel trägt.

⁽¹⁷⁾ So z. B. H.-C. SCHMITT, *Elisa*. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur vorklassischen nordisraelitischen Prophetie (Gütersloh 1972) 131–136; J. VAN SETERS, *In Search of History*. Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History (New Haven-London 1983) 305f.; WÜRTHEIN, *Könige*, 205, 236, 262, 366–368; H.-J. STIPP, *Elischa – Propheten – Gottesmänner*. Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Elischa-zyklus und verwandter Texte, rekonstruiert auf der Basis von Text- und Literarkritik zu 1 Kön 20,22 und 2 Kön 2–7 (ATSAT 24; St. Ottilien 1987) 361–480; O'BRIEN, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 202, 204 Anm. 104; MCKENZIE, *Trouble with Kings*, 81–100.

DtrG mitunter die aufgenommenen Materialien nur marginal retuschiert. Das gilt etwa für einen Großteil der Davidserzählungen. Aus unserem Bereich ist 2 Kön 1,1-17b* ein instruktiver Fall. Der Geschichte von der Orakelanfrage Ahasjas beim Baal-Sebub von Ekron läßt sich mangels eindeutiger dtr Züge kein dtr Ursprung zuschreiben. Gleichwohl ist sie unlösbar mit dem dtr Rahmen verzahnt und muß von Beginn an dem DtrG* angehört haben⁽¹⁸⁾. Die Todesnotiz 17ab, als Erfüllungsvermerk zu Elijas Gerichtswort in den vv. 3-6 geformt, ist unentbehrlicher Bestandteil der Erzählung. Folglich entstammt diese Todesnotiz nicht dem dtr Rahmenwerk, sondern der eingearbeiteten Vorlage, der man den Rahmen anpaßte. Auch die Abwesenheit der Formel vom "Ruhem mit den Vätern" bezeugt, daß man bei der Auswahl der Schlußformeln für Ahasja von Israel auf eine Quelle Rücksicht nahm, die den "unfriedlichen" Tod des Königs dokumentierte.

Das Fehlen dtr Merkmale ist daher kein Argument für einen späteren Einbau ins DtrG. Wer eine solche Behauptung erhebt, muß sich auf andere Tatsachen berufen, was zumeist auch geschieht⁽¹⁹⁾. Triftig erscheinen beispielsweise folgende Gründe: Die betreffenden Erzählungen enthalten Züge, die die Frage aufwerfen, bis zu welchem Punkt Deuteronomisten bereit waren, den als Gesetzespredigern verstandenen Propheten (2 Kön 17,13) das Privileg einzuräumen, sich über die Grundsätze dtr Theologie hinwegzusetzen. Nachdem in 2 Kön 5 Naaman zum Bekenntnis der Einzigkeit Jhwhs gefunden hat (v. 15), gestattet ihm Elischa, in seinem Heimatland auf importierter israelitischer Erde Jhwh "Ganz- und Schlachtopfer" darzubringen. Er darf sogar weiter seine amtlichen Funktionen im staatlichen Rimmonkult erfüllen, bis dahin, daß er sich in einem heidnischen Tempel "anbetend niederwirft" (הִתְחַנֵּף; vv. 17-19). Ob

⁽¹⁸⁾ Vgl. W. THIEL, "Deuteronomistische Redaktionsarbeit in den Elia-Erzählungen", *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (VTS 43; [ed. J. A. EMERTON] Leiden 1991) 156-158.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Diese Klarstellung erscheint notwendig angesichts von THIEL, "Dtr Redaktionsarbeit", 158 Anm. 29. Danach begründen SCHMITT, WÜRTHEIN und ich (vgl. Anm. 17) den sekundären Einbau des Elischazyklus mit dem Fehlen dtr Züge. Dies tut jedoch nur WÜRTHEIN (ebd. 367), im Unterschied zu SCHMITT (vgl. seine Argumentation S. 131-136) und mir (der Schluß auf die Beteiligung nicht-dtr Kräfte S. 479f. ist nicht mit dem Nachweis der Nachträge selbst zu verwechseln). Infolgedessen wird uns einzig ein Argument zugeschrieben, das wir mangels Tauglichkeit nicht verwenden, während unsere wirklichen Gründe ungenannt bleiben.

das noch innerhalb der den Propheten zugestandenen Spielräume lag? Schließlich prangerten die Deuteronomisten die Mißachtung der Zentralisationsforderung als die Todsünde des Nordreichs an (1 Kön 12,26-32; 13,34 usw.) und strichen im unmittelbaren Kontext den Götzenkult des Hauses Ahab als den Gipfel der Verkommenheit heraus (1 Kön 21,25f.; ferner 16,31f.; 18,18; 22,53f.; 2 Kön 1; 10,18-28; 11,18; vgl. 3,2). Wiederholt wird gerade die Prostratio (חורו-Št) vor Baal den omridischen Königen vorgeworfen (1 Kön 16,31; 22,54). Konnten Deuteronomisten da einen Text wie 2 Kön 5 ohne die Gefahr von Mißverständnissen akzeptieren? Ist ihnen — ausgerechnet in diesem Kontext — die jenem Kapitel innewohnende Unterscheidung von äußerem Akt und innerer Haltung zuzutruen? Ebenfalls im Widerspruch zu dtr Maximen steht 2 Kön 3,19, wo Elischa in einem als Jhwh-Rede verstehbaren Zusammenhang ankündigt: „Jeden guten Baum werdet ihr fällen!“ Das ist eine offene Zuwiderhandlung gegen das dtn Kriegsgesetz, das die Schonung des gegnerischen Baumbestandes fordert (Dtn 20,19f.). Sollten Deuteronomisten derartige Texte akzeptiert haben, obwohl ihnen nichts mehr am Herzen lag als die Observanz des dtn Gesetzes, zumal das Verbot illegitimer Kultformen? Sollten sie ganz auf Korrekturen verzichtet haben, obgleich sie, wie etwa das unten näher betrachtete Kapitel 1 Kön 21 lehrt, ihre Vorlagen bei Bedarf freizügig umschrieben? Die Schriftpropheten haben sie sogar souverän verschwiegen⁽²⁰⁾; im Fal-

(20) Dazu sollen der Fachdiskussion zufolge schon sehr sublimen Gründe ausgereicht haben. Vgl. z. B. K.-F. POHLMANN, „Erwägungen zum Schlußkapitel des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes. Oder: Warum wird der Prophet Jeremia in 2. Kön 22-25 nicht erwähnt?“, *Textgemäß* (FS. E. WÜRTHWEIN; [Hrsg. A. H. J. GUNNEWEG – O. KAISER] Göttingen 1979) 94-109; K. KOCH, „Das Profetenschweigen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes“, *Die Botschaft und die Boten* (FS. H. W. WOLFF; [Hrsg. J. JEREMIAS – L. PERLITT] Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981) 115-128; C. BEGG, „A Bible Mystery: The Absence of Jeremiah in the Deuteronomistic History“, *Irish Biblical Studies* 7 (1985) 139-164; DERS., „The Non-mention of Ezekiel in Deuteronomistic History, the Book of Jeremiah and the Chronic History“, *Ezekiel and his Book. Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation* (ed. J. LUST) (BETL 74; Leuven 1986) 341f.; DERS., „The Non-mention of Amos, Hosea and Micah in the Deuteronomistic History“, *BN* 32 (1986) 41-53; DERS., „The Non-mention of Zephaniah, Nahum and Habakkuk in the Deuteronomistic History“, *BN* 38/39 (1987) 19-25. Erklärt ist wohl einstweilen lediglich die Nichterwähnung Jeremias und Ezechiels, deren Warnungen vor antibabylonischer Politik zur Zeit Zidkijas Konflikte mit heilsprophetisch radikalisierten Deuteronomisten her-

le des einzigen Gegenbeispiels Jesaja haben sie sein Bild durchgreifend umgeformt.

Vielfach aufgefallen sind die Spannungen zwischen einzelnen Prophetenerzählungen und dem dtr Rahmen der Königsbücher. Die Elischaerzählungen in 2 Kön 2 und 13,14-21 sind nicht, wie üblich, sandwichartig in die dtr Königsrahmen eingefügt, sondern stehen außerhalb des Gerüsts. Daß man dies schon in der Antike als Verletzung der Architektur des Werkes empfand, zeigen Korrekturversuche: Die Schlußformeln für Joasch von Israel 2 Kön 13,12f. wurden in 14,15f. wiederholt, um die regelwidrige Desintegration von 13,14-25 zu beheben⁽²¹⁾. Den Vorderteil des Rahmens für Joram von Israel 2 Kön 3,1-3 hat man in der durch LXX repräsentierten Textform am Ende von 2 Kön 1 verdoppelt, um denselben Zweck für 2 Kön 2 zu erreichen⁽²²⁾. 2 Kön 3 läßt neben Joschafat einen "König von Edom" auftreten (vv. 9.12.26). Dabei erklärt der Königsrahmen für Joschafat in 1 Kön 22,48 ausdrücklich, damals habe es in Edom keinen König gegeben⁽²³⁾, und 8,20 berichtet, die Edomiter hätten zur Zeit Jorams von Juda einen König eingesetzt. Dem Rahmengerüst liegt ein System zugrunde, wonach die Edomiter unter Joschafat judäische Vasallen waren und keinen König besaßen, aber schon unter Joram ihre Unabhängigkeit wiedererrangen, was sie in der Königserhebung zum Ausdruck brachten. Diese Angaben erklären, wie Joschafat laut 1 Kön 22,49f. versuchen konnte, von Ezjon-Geber aus eine judäische Handelsschiffahrt aufzubauen. Offenkundig wurden die Notizen ohne Rücksicht auf 2 Kön 3 formuliert. Zwar fußen die Königsrahmen gewiß auf vordtr Quellen wie etwa offiziellen Annalen. Beispiele wie die Schlußformeln der Rahmen für Ahasja und Joram von Israel oder Ahasja von Juda zeigen jedoch, daß die Schöpfer des DtrG* das Rahmenwerk auf die eingeflochtenen Erzählstücke abstimmten.

aufbeschworen; vgl. C. HARDMEIER, *Prophetie im Streit vor dem Untergang Judas*. Erzählkommunikative Studien zur Entstehungssituation der Jesaja- und Jeremiaerzählungen in II Reg 18-20 und Jer 37-40 (BZAW 187; Berlin-New York 1990), bes. 321ff.

⁽²¹⁾ Bei der Wahl des Ortes für die Dublette nahm man zusätzlich auf 2 Kön 14,8-14 Rücksicht.

⁽²²⁾ Diese Differenz ist Teil eines größeren divergierenden Systems der Chronologie und Textanordnung. Einzelheiten: STIPP, *Elischa*, 63-87, und die dort zitierte Literatur.

⁽²³⁾ Die Worte עַד מֶלֶךְ 48b sind beschädigt und kein Gegenargument; vgl. die Einzeldiskussion ebd. 72-76.

Wohlbekannt ist der Gegensatz zwischen der Erzählung 1 Kön 22,1-38, wonach Ahab im Kampf gegen die Aramäer fiel, und der Rahmennotiz 1 Kön 22,40, laut der Ahab "mit seinen Vätern ruhte", einer Formel, die sonst nur auf Könige angewandt wird, die unter friedlichen Umständen starben⁽²⁴⁾. Damit zusammen hängt 1 Kön 21,27-29, das aufgrund seiner besonderen Probleme eine breitere Behandlung verlangt.

II. Ahabs Buße und die Komposition des DtrG

Die Notiz von Ahabs Buße und Strafaufschub beschließt die Geschichte vom Justizmord an Nabot, die anders als die umgebenden Prophetenerzählungen stark dtr bearbeitet ist. Ohne daß man auf Einzelheiten der vorstufenkritischen Analyse des Kapitels eingehen muß, läßt sich als annähernder Konsens festhalten, daß in den vv.20e-22.24-26 Zutaten aus dtr Feder vorliegen, die an Spannungen zum Kontext und typischer Idiomatik kenntlich sind und einen älteren Schluß ersetzt haben⁽²⁵⁾. Das dtr Gerichtswort kündigt Ahab in den formelhaften Wendungen des Dynastieworts (vgl. 1 Kön 14,10f.; 16,3f.; 2 Kön 9,8) die Ausrottung seiner Sippe an. In den abschließenden vv.27-29 reagiert der Omride auf Elijas Drohungen mit Bußakten, worauf Jhwh in einer Rede an Elija erklärt, "das Unheil" erst in den Tagen von Ahabs Sohn "über sein Haus" bringen zu wollen. Die Gottesrede wird in der Regel so verstanden, daß Jhwh die Strafe für die Frevel Ahabs in die Zeit Jorams verschiebt, wo sie von Jehu durch die Austilgung der Omridensippe vollzogen wird.

Nachdem O. H. Steck die Nachrichten von Ahabs Buße noch in den Beginn der Herrschaft Jehus datiert hatte⁽²⁶⁾, meldete A. Jepsen aufgrund geistesgeschichtlicher und terminologischer Erwägungen

⁽²⁴⁾ B. ALFRINK, "L'expression עם אבותיו", *OTS* 2 (1943) 106-118. Seine These ist gelegentlich wegen 2 Kön 14,22 angefochten worden; vgl. dagegen STIPP, *Elischa*, 199 Anm. 129; HALPERN – VANDERHOOF, "Editions of Kings", 186-188.

⁽²⁵⁾ Neuere Überblicke: M. OEMING, "Naboth, der Jesreeliter. Untersuchungen zu den theologischen Motiven der Überlieferungsgeschichte von I Reg 21", *ZAW* 98 (1986) 363f.; R. MARTIN-ACHARD, "La vigne de Naboth (1 Rois 21) d'après des études récentes", *ÉTR* 66 (1991) 1-16.

⁽²⁶⁾ O. H. STECK, *Überlieferung und Zeitgeschichte in den Elia-Erzählungen* (WMANT 26; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968) 45; so auch M. WHITE, "Naboth's Vineyard and Jehu's Coup: The Legitimation of a Dynastic Extermination", *VT* 44 (1994) 76.

Bedenken an⁽²⁷⁾. Daß Ahab die Liquidation seiner Dynastie nicht mehr erlebte, habe erst dann eigens motiviert werden müssen, nachdem sich in Israel das individuelle Vergeltungsdenken durchgesetzt habe. Dafür gebe es aber erst ab der chronistischen Epoche zufriedenstellende Belege. Auch die Ausdrucksweise von v. 29, mit כנו-N eine "Unterwerfung unter Jahwe" (150) zu bezeichnen, begegne sonst vor allem in 2 Chr. Deshalb seien die vv. 27-29 als "nachdeuteronomistischer Zusatz" (154) zu beurteilen. Allerdings enthält das DtrG in 2 Kön 22,19 einen weiteren einschlägigen Beleg von כנו-N, und in 2 Kön 14,6 findet sich sogar ein ausdrückliches Bekenntnis zum in Dtn 24,16 niedergelegten Prinzip der Individualhaftung. Wenn man ferner wie Jepsen meint, die vv. 27-29 seien erst später als 1 Kön 22 in ihren Kontext eingedrungen⁽²⁸⁾, stellt sich die Frage, welcher Zweck dem Strafaufschub überhaupt noch zgedacht gewesen sein soll, wo Ahab doch sogleich in der nächsten Erzählung von seinem Schicksal ereilt wird. Wählt man überdies nicht allein das Verb כנו-N, sondern die in 1 Kön 21,29 verwendete Fügung כנו (ל) פני-N als Vergleichsgrundlage, ergibt sich ein Korpus von 11 Belegen, die ausschließlich aus dtr Passagen und 2 Chr 33-36 stammen, und zwar etwa gleichmäßig verteilt⁽²⁹⁾. Daher wird man zwar besser von einer Frühdatierung ins 9. Jh. Abstand nehmen, aber es nötigt auch nichts dazu, unter die dtr Ebene herabzugehen. Die Wortereignisformel (v. 28) und die Wendung הביא רעה (v. 29) sind zwar nicht auf die dtr Sphäre beschränkt⁽³⁰⁾, waren aber bei dtr Autoren beliebt und sind somit der Herleitung aus dtr Feder günstig.

Es überzeugt deshalb eher, die Notiz von Ahabs Buße und Strafaufschub schon dem originalen Bestand des DtrG zuzuschreiben. Dann stehen 1 Kön 21,27-29 und 22,40 in Einklang: Laut der bei Schaffung des DtrG* federführenden Theorie leistete Ahab nach dem Ergehen des göttlichen Strafwords Buße; daraufhin verschob

(27) A. JEPSEN, "Ahabs Buße. Ein kleiner Beitrag zur Methode literarhistorischer Einordnung", *Archäologie und Altes Testament* (FS. K. GALLING; [Hrsg. A. KUSCHKE – E. KUTSCH] Tübingen 1970) 145-155 = DERS., *Der Herr ist Gott* (Berlin 1978) 124-131.

(28) A. JEPSEN, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (Halle 21956) 8, 78.

(29) Dtr: Ri 8,28; 11,33; 1 Kön 21,29(2x); 2 Kön 22,19 par 2 Chr 34,27(2x). Sonst 2 Chr 33,12.19.23; 36,12.

(30) Vgl. zu הביא רעה die Distributionsanalyse bei H.-J. STIPP, *Jeremia im Parteienstreit*. Studien zur Textentwicklung von Jer 26,36-43 und 45 als Beitrag zur Geschichte Jeremias, seines Buches und jüdischer Parteien im 6. Jahrhundert (BBB 82; Frankfurt a. M. 1992) 119.

Jhwh das Eintreffen des Gerichts auf die Zeit Jorams, und Ahab verstarb eines natürlichen Todes. Dann kann aber 1 Kön 22,1-38 bei der Abfassung von 21,27-29 und 22,40 noch nicht vorgesehen gewesen sein.

Freilich ist diese Deutung des Strafaufschubs auch als Mißverständnis zurückgewiesen worden. Nach D. W. Gooding ist v. 29 wie folgt zu verstehen:

The respite granted upon Ahab's contrition was, in fact, concerned altogether and only with the judgment on Ahab's *house*: "I will not bring the evil in his day; but in his son's days will I bring the evil upon his house" (MT 21,19). True to this promise the judgment on Ahab's house was postponed ... But nothing had at any time been said about postponing Ahab's personal doom; and therefore it is not an inconsequence when that doom follows immediately [in 1 Kön 22,1-38] after the promise of the respite⁽³¹⁾.

Demnach verfügt v. 29 eine Streckung des Gerichts in zwei Phasen, so daß unbeschadet Ahabs individueller Züchtigung nur die Dynastie eine Gnadenfrist bis Joram erhält. Ist dies korrekt, ist die Behauptung eines Gegensatzes zu 1 Kön 22,1-38 unberechtigt, und die geläufige Ansicht, die Schöpfer des DtrG hätten das Prädikat שָׁכַב עִם אֲבוֹתָיו friedlich verstorbenen Herrschern vorbehalten, muß wegen v. 40 neu überdacht werden.

Die konträren Interpretationen von 1 Kön 21,29 lassen sich zurückführen auf unterschiedliche Vorstellungen, wie der Ausdruck "über sein Haus" (עַל-בֵּיתוֹ) syntaktisch mit den Worten "ich werde das Unheil kommen lassen" (אֲבִיָּא הָרָעָה) verknüpft ist. Nach der üblichen Deutung ist die Präpositionalverbindung vom Verb abhängig: "In den Tagen seines Sohnes werde ich das Unheil über seine Familie kommen lassen". Danach bricht die Strafe unter Joram herein, und nichts spricht dafür, daß auch Ahab selbst noch das Gericht am eigenen Leibe verspüren wird. Goodings Leseweise setzt dagegen voraus, daß עַל-בֵּיתוֹ eine appositionelle Bestimmung zu הָרָעָה

⁽³¹⁾ D. W. GOODING, "Ahab According to the Septuagint", *ZAW* 76 (1964) 277 (Hervorhebung Goodings). Seiner Deutung von v. 29 (MT) stimmt zu: P.-M. BOGAERT, "Le repentir d'Achab d'après la Bible hébraïque (1 R 21) et d'après la Septante (3 Règnes 20)", *Élie le prophète. Bible, tradition, iconographie* (éd. G. F. WILLEMS) (Leuven o. J. [1987]) 55. Ebenso scheint J. M. HAMILTON, "Caught in the Nets of Prophecy? The Death of King Ahab and the Character of God", *CBQ* 56 (1994) 650f., den Passus zu verstehen.

bildet: "In den Tagen seines Sohnes werde ich das seiner Familie drohende Unheil kommen lassen". Danach würde unterschieden zwischen den Strafmaßnahmen, die Ahab selbst, und denjenigen, die seine Sippe trafen. So ließe sich erklären, warum Jhwh zwar nach Ahabs Reuebekundungen einen Strafaufschub verfügt, 22,38 aber trotzdem den Schlachtentod des Königs als Erfüllung von Elijas Gerichtsworten in Kap. 21 deklariert. Die Unterscheidung zwischen zwei Schüben der Strafe mag spitzfindig klingen, doch weitere Gesichtspunkte rücken Goodings Deutung in ein anderes Licht.

Warum wird in v. 29 Jhwh ein Strafaufschub für Ahab in den Mund gelegt? Die Antwort scheint auf der Hand zu liegen: Weil eben die Omridendynastie nicht unter Ahab, sondern erst unter seinem übernächsten Nachfolger stürzte. Doch diese anscheinend selbstverständliche Auskunft stellt nicht zufrieden. Der Gebrauch des Dynastieworts und Rückverweise auf Jhwhs Gerichte über die früheren Herrscherhäuser des Nordreichs (16,3; 21,22) verknüpfen die Darstellungen des Sturzes der Familien Jerobeams, Baschas und Omris zu einem System, innerhalb dessen der Strafaufschub für Ahab zu beurteilen ist. Dabei zeigt der Vergleich: Auch Jerobeam und Bascha wird durch das Dynastiewort die Ausrottung ihrer Sippe angekündigt; doch ohne daß sie wie Ahab einen Strafaufschub erhielten, treffen die Prophezeiungen erst unter ihren Söhnen ein, während sie selbst eines natürlichen Todes sterben *וַיָּשָׁכְבְּ עִם אֲבֹתָיו* (1 Kön 14,20; 16,6). In diesen Fällen gibt es keinen Hinweis, daß der Verzug der Katastrophe als Problem empfunden worden wäre. Das verspätete Ende der Omriden als solches kann folglich nicht der Grund gewesen sein, warum ein dtr Autor den besonderen Gnadenakt Jhwhs für erforderlich hielt. Faktisch erzeugt der Strafaufschub für Ahab im vorfindlichen Kontext ein Paradox: Einerseits ist Ahab der einzige Empfänger des Dynastieworts, dessen Strafe verschoben wird; andererseits ist er der einzige, den die Strafe selber trifft.

Die Suche nach den tatsächlichen Motiven für den eigens verfüigten Aufschub führt auf Formulierungsdifferenzen in den Strafan-sagen der Dynastieworte.

1 Kön 14,10f.: Deshalb siehe, ich lasse Unheil kommen über das Haus Jerobeams. Ich werde von Jerobeam ausrotten, was an die Wand pißt, unmündig und mündig⁽³²⁾ in Israel. Ich werde hinter

⁽³²⁾ Der Sinn der Wendung *עצור ועורב* ist umstritten; hier Wiedergabe nach HAL 824. Vgl. die Zusammenstellung der Übersetzungsvorschläge

dem Haus Jerobeams ausfegen, wie man den Kot hinausfegt, bis es ausgetilgt ist.

Wer von Jerobeam in der Stadt stirbt, den werden die Hunde fressen, und wer auf dem Feld stirbt, den werden die Vögel des Himmels fressen.

1. Kön 16,3f.: Siehe, ich fege aus hinter Bascha und seinem Haus. Ich werde 'sein' Haus dem Haus des Jerobeam ben Nebat gleich machen. Wer von Bascha in der Stadt stirbt, den werden die Hunde fressen, und wer von ihm auf dem Feld stirbt, den werden die Vögel des Himmels fressen.

1 Kön 21,21f.24: Siehe, ich lasse Unheil über dich kommen und werde hinter dir ausfegen. Ich werde von Ahab ausrotten, was an die Wand pißt, unmündig und mündig in Israel. Ich werde dein Haus dem Haus des Jerobeam ben Nebat und dem Haus des Bascha ben Ahija gleich machen. ... Wer von Ahab in der Stadt stirbt, den werden die Hunde fressen, und wer auf dem Feld stirbt, den werden die Vögel des Himmels fressen.

Eine Besonderheit der an Ahab gerichteten Fassung des Dynastieworts ist die auf ihn selbst zugeschnittene Wendung "siehe, ich lasse Unheil *über dich* kommen" (21a) *הִנֵּי מִבִּי אֵלַיךְ רָעָה* (21a). Sie kontrastiert mit der Formulierung "siehe, ich lasse Unheil kommen *über das Haus Jerobeams*" in 1 Kön 14,10 und dem Fehlen eines vergleichbaren Passus in der Strafanündigung an Bascha. Streng beim Wort genommen, soll die bevorstehende Ausrottung demnach auch Ahab persönlich einschließen, während bei Jerobeam und Bascha derlei Festlegungen vermieden werden. Die für Ahab bestimmte Version paßt zu dem Umstand, daß Elija zuvor in v. 19gh dem Omriden ein individuelles Drohwort entgegenschleudert: "An dem Ort, wo die Hunde das Blut Nabots leckten, werden die Hunde auch dein Blut lecken!". Diese Differenzen deuten darauf hin, daß die Deuteronomisten, die durch das Dynastiewort die Schicksale der kurzlebigen Herrscherhäuser des Nordreichs in einem kohärenten geschichtstheologischen Schema systematisierten, in der jeweiligen Einzelformulierung durchaus unterschieden, ob lediglich der Untergang der Königsfamilie als solcher prophezeit wurde — so bei Jerobeam und Bascha —, oder ob auch der gerade verurteilte König selbst der Ka-

von D. P. WRIGHT – J. MILGROM, Art. *עָצָר* 'āṣar, ThWANT, VI, 335; ferner S. TALMON – W. F. FIELDS, "The Collocation *עָצָר וְעֹזֹב* and its Meaning", ZAW 101 (1989) 112: "technical terms designating ranking members of the royal houses in Israel".

tastrophe zum Opfer fallen sollte, wie allem Anschein nach bei Ahab. Der göttliche Strafaufschub ist demnach in v. 21 durch eine geeignete Adaption des Dynastieworts vorbereitet. Der individuelle Zuschnitt von v. 21 machte überhaupt erst den ausdrücklichen Aufschub notwendig, denn die verzögerte Liquidation der Familie bedurfte dessen, wie gezeigt, nicht.

Der Vergleich mit den anderen Versionen des Dynastieworts ergibt, daß die Strafmilderung nicht in der verspäteten Auslöschung der Omriden bestanden haben kann, und 1 Kön 21,21 (zusammen mit v. 19) bestätigt, daß sie sich auf die einzige denkbare Alternative bezogen haben muß: das persönliche Schicksal Ahabs. Aufgrund von Kontexterwägungen ist also zu erwarten, daß die Modifikation der Vergeltung in 1 Kön 21,27-29 wie folgt funktioniert: Die Gottesrede in den vv. 19-24 erließ ein Strafmaß, das Ahabs gewaltsamen und unehrenhaften Tod einschloß. Wegen der Bußakte des Königs wurde es zu demjenigen abgemildert, das auch für Jerobeam und Bascha galt.

Wie verhalten sich diese äußeren Gesichtspunkte zur Frage nach dem Sinn der Präpositionalverbindung *על-ביתו* in v. 29? Hier ist die Diskussion nochmals aufzunehmen und durch weitere Aspekte auf eine breitere Grundlage zu stellen. Zunächst sind syntaktische und stilistische Besonderheiten zu beachten.

29d לא אבי הרעה בימיו

29e בימיו בנו אביא הרעה על ביתו

Der unterschiedlich gedeutete Satz 29e ist asyndetisch. Asyndetische Satzreihung stiftet im Hebräischen zumeist eine engere Bindung als Syndese mit *w=* und stellt den asyndetischen Satz in der Regel in ein explikatives Verhältnis zum vorangehenden⁽³³⁾. Deshalb ist von 29e eine Präzisierung von 29d zu erwarten. Den Konnex der beiden Sätze bestimmt ferner, daß sie die Arme eines Chiasmus folgender Struktur bilden:

29d [verbales Präd. (negiert) + Objekt] – [Zeitangabe]

29e [Zeitangabe] – [verbales Präd. + Objekt] – [על-ביתו]

Weil Prädikat und Objekt ihre interne Reihenfolge nicht ändern, stehen sie als zusammengehörige Blöcke den Zeitangaben gegenüber.

⁽³³⁾ P. JOÜON – T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Vol. II: Syntax (Roma 1991) 649 (§ 177a).

Dafür spricht auch, daß Prädikat und Objekt in beiden Sätzen exakt gleich lauten: אביא הרעה. Was sich wandelt, sind die Zeitangaben, doch nur durch den Austausch eines enklitischen Personalpronomens gegen ein Nomen rectum: בימי בנו – בימי. Ferner ist 29d negiert, und in 29e tritt על-ביתו hinzu. Die hochgradige Übereinstimmung der beiden Hälften verleiht dem Chiasmus ein besonders strenges Gepräge und bewirkt eine starke Hervorhebung der Differenzen. Die Negation in 29d ist auf das Verb bezogen und verneint daher den ganzen Satz, aber wegen der chiasmatischen Konfrontation mit dem Folgesatz, wo eine teilidentische Aussage umgekehrt affirmiert wird, wirkt sie sich ebenfalls bei den Unterschieden zu jenem aus und erzeugt einen ausgeprägten Kontrastfokus.

Daß der Chiasmus die Opposition der Zeitangaben — und nicht על-ביתו — unterstreichen soll, ergeben weitere Beobachtungen zu seiner Form. Die Ausdrücke בימי בנו und בימי stehen im Zentrum unmittelbar benachbart, so daß ihre Differenz besonders intensiv betont erscheint. Außerdem rückt die Zeitangabe in 29e vor das Verb. Die Stellung im "Vorfeld" des Satzes verleiht obliquen Satzgliedern (also solchen, die nicht Subjekt sind) in der Regel eine ausgeprägte Emphase⁽³⁴⁾. Zwar sind bei Zeitangaben Ausnahmen möglich, insofern sie bisweilen ohne Fokussierung vor das Verb treten können⁽³⁵⁾, doch machen die anderen Formen der Hervorhebung von בימי בנו wahrscheinlich, daß hier auch die Vorfeldposition den Nachdruck verstärkt. Nach stilistischen Gesichtspunkten stellt daher 29de "seine" Tage prononciert den Tagen "seines Sohnes" gegenüber. Die folgende Übersetzung versucht, die stilistischen Effekte der relevanten syntaktischen Merkmale zur Geltung zu bringen:

⁽³⁴⁾ W. GROSS hat unter dem Namen "Vorfeld" ihre grammatischen Regularitäten erschlossen und begonnen, die stilistischen Wirkungen verschiedener Besetzungen des Vorfelds zu beschreiben. Vgl. "Die Position des Subjekts im hebräischen Verbalsatz, untersucht an den asyndetischen ersten Redesätzen in Gen, Ex 1-19, Jos-2 Kön", *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 6 (1993) 170-187; "Das Vorfeld als strukturell eigenständiger Bereich des hebräischen Verbalsatzes. Syntaktische Erscheinungen am Satzbeginn", *Syntax und Text*. Beiträge zur 22. Internationalen Ökumenischen Hebräisch-Dozenten-Konferenz 1993 in Bamberg (Hrsg. H. IRSIGLER) (ATSAT 40; St. Ottilien 1993) 1-24; "Zur syntaktischen Struktur des Vorfeldes im hebräischen Verbalsatz", *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 7 (1994) 203-214.

⁽³⁵⁾ GROSS, "Vorfeld" 20. Hier sind von der Publikation weiterer Ergebnisse Präzisierungen zu erwarten.

- 29d Ich werde das Unheil nicht in *seinen* Tagen kommen lassen;
 29e (das heißt: erst) in den Tagen *seines Sohnes* werde ich das Unheil über sein Haus kommen lassen.
 (Oder, nach Gooding:)
 (das heißt: erst) in den Tagen *seines Sohnes* werde ich das seinem Haus drohende Unheil kommen lassen.

Mit dem logischen und stilistischen Profil der beiden Sätze ist das herkömmliche Verständnis, wonach der Passus eine uneingeschränkte Verschiebung der Strafe auf die Jahre Jorams meint, problemlos vereinbar. Dagegen ist der Befund Goodings Interpretation wenig günstig. Ausweislich der Platzierung des Satzakzents in 29e betont der Sprecher nicht die Differenz zwischen zwei sukzessiven Portionen der Strafe, sondern (nur) zwischen zwei Zeiten ihres Eintreffens: nicht zur Zeit Ahabs, sondern zur Zeit Jorams. Wäre Goodings Deutung im Recht, wäre jedoch (auch) ersteres zu erwarten.

Wenn zudem 29e den vorangehenden Satz explikativ erläutert, würde man, sofern der Passus auf eine Staffelung der Strafe im Sinne Goodings zielte, erwarten, daß על-ביתו nicht (nur) appositionell an הוהרעה in 29e angeschlossen, sondern bereits dem gleichlautenden Ausdruck in 29d beigegeben wäre. Denn 29d kündigt zunächst eine komplette Verschiebung der Katastrophe an. Mit Gooding muß man annehmen, daß der Autor erst eine mißverständliche Formulierung gewählt hätte, um dann durch 29e nicht nur der Dynastie eine Frist zu setzen, sondern vor allem nachträglich klarzustellen, daß von vornherein nur an eine Aufspaltung des Gerichts in zwei Phasen gedacht war.

Solche Beobachtungen lassen die Auskunft, v.29 denke in Wahrheit an ein zweistufiges Gericht, an sich sehr bedenklich erscheinen. Gleichwohl könnte Goodings Interpretation ein gewisses Recht besitzen. Dafür spricht ein textkritischer Sachverhalt: Der fraglichen Präpositionalverbindung על-ביתו fehlt ein Äquivalent in dem durch die Septuaginta (*G**) repräsentierten Textüberlieferungsstrang⁽³⁶⁾, so daß dort nichts an eine Einschränkung des Strafaufschubs denken läßt. Nachträgliche Tilgung ist nicht plausibel zu machen⁽³⁷⁾. Aus welchem Grund sollte man angesichts von 1 Kön

⁽³⁶⁾ Darauf ging Gooding nicht näher ein. Diese Lücke hat BOGAERT, "Repentir d'Achab", 55, gefüllt.

⁽³⁷⁾ Vgl. BOGAERT, ebd.; STIPP, *Elischa*, 427f.

22,38 gewünscht haben, eine (mögliche) Modifikation des uneingeschränkten Strafaufschubs zu beseitigen? Dagegen läßt sich ein Zusatz in der masoretischen Tradition motivieren, wobei Goodings Verständnis der masoretischen Fassung von 29e einen Fingerzeig liefert.

Während man an den masoretischen Wortlaut von 21,29e immerhin die Frage richten kann, ob er nur die Liquidation der Dynastie verschiebt, Ahabs individuelle Züchtigung aber unangetastet läßt, bietet der Vers in *G** dazu keinerlei Anhalt. Diese Tatbestände lassen sich mit folgenden Annahmen herleiten: Die Septuaginta hat in 21,19e einen älteren Textentwicklungsstand konserviert, der im Einklang mit 22,40 einen uneingeschränkten Strafaufschub vollzog. Deshalb ist die Hypothese im Recht, daß 1 Kön 22,1-38 bei Abfassung von 21,27-29 und 22,40 noch nicht vorgesehen war. Als die Erzählung von Ahabs Kriegertod, den v. 38 auch noch *expressis verbis* als Erfüllung von Eljas Gerichtswort hinstellte, ins DtrG einging, entstand ein offener Widerspruch zur Notiz vom Strafaufschub für Ahab. Der Zusatz von על-ביתו könnte dem Wunsch entwachsen sein, die Diskrepanz zu mildern. Hier ist der Deutungsvorschlag Goodings hilfreich. Möglicherweise war bei der Interpolation die Absicht leitend, eine Unterscheidung zwischen zwei Phasen des Gerichts einzuführen: eine für Ahab persönlich und eine für seine Sippe. Ist dieses Motiv korrekt erschlossen, wird es an der sprachlichen Oberfläche allerdings nicht sehr deutlich, weil es sich in 21,29e (*MT*) dann ja nicht um eine originäre Formulierung handelt, sondern um redaktionelles Flickwerk, das sein Aussageziel mit sparsamen Mitteln gegen die syntaktische und stilistische Physiognomie des älteren Wortlauts durchzusetzen sucht. Wegen der Unklarheit des hybriden Endtextes kann diese Erklärung von על-ביתו auch nur ein Vorschlag sein, der eine gewisse Plausibilität beanspruchen kann, aber vielleicht einmal einer besseren Herleitung Platz machen muß.

Aus alldem folgt, daß jene im Recht sind, die die Nachrichten von Ahabs Buße und Strafaufschub als ein Zeugnis für die Kompositionsgeschichte des DtrG werten. 1 Kön 21,27-29* ist — ebenso wie 22,40 — mit 21,1-38 unvereinbar und dokumentiert, daß es eine Entwicklungsstufe des Werkes gegeben hat, die wohl 1 Kön 21, nicht aber die Geschichte von Ahabs Feldzug nach Ramot-Gilead enthielt. 21,29 ist kein Gegenbeweis, da man den masoretischen Wortlaut zwar als Versuch der Berücksichtigung von 22,1-38 lesen kann, was dann aber auf einer sehr späten und recht unvollkommenen Anpassungsmaßnahme beruht.

Der älteren Fassung des DtrG lag das Konzept zugrunde, daß Jhwh dem frevlerischen König die Strafe in einer Form zumaß, die jenen selbst einschloß (1 Kön 21,19gh.21a). Nach Ahabs Buße wurde das Gericht auf die Zeit Jorams vertagt (21,27-29*), worauf der Mörder Nabots eines natürlichen Todes starb (22,40). Der Charakter der betreffenden Passagen (von 21,19 abgesehen) deutet auf einen dtr Ursprung dieses Systems. Dazu paßt, daß die Idee, die verspätete Erfüllung eines (auch) individuell formulierten Gerichtsworts müsse begründet werden, ein fortgeschrittenes Reflexionsniveau widerspiegelt; das andersartige Empfinden früherer Epochen illustriert noch der Vers 2 Kön 9,26, der nichts dabei findet, wenn die Ahab präsentierte Drohung "ich werde dir heimzahlen" erst unter Joram eintrifft. Hinweise auf einen älteren Kern in 21,27-29 sind dementsprechend nicht erkennbar. Der Hauptgrund für die Entstehung der Theorie von Ahabs Buße war nach den vorhandenen Fingerzeigen das dtr Ahabbild, wonach dieser König den Gipfel der Frevel des Nordreichs verkörperte (1 Kön 16,30-33; 21,25f.)⁽³⁸⁾. Deshalb bedurfte es der Erklärung, wie Jhwh die Ahndung seiner Untaten so lange hatte verzögern können⁽³⁹⁾. Das Vorliegen einer individuellen Strafanündigung in 21,19gh war dagegen kaum entscheidend, denn der dtr Bearbeiter der Naboterzählung ging mit seiner Vorlage ohnehin freizügig um und hätte bei Bedarf auch dieses Wort umgestalten können⁽⁴⁰⁾.

⁽³⁸⁾ Freilich gerät man auch hier in das Dickicht der divergierenden literarkritischen Analysen. In den vv.25f. wird oft eine jüngere (dtr) Hand erkannt; neueste Vertreter: THIEL, "Dtr Redaktionsarbeit", 160; W.M. SCHNIEWIND, "History and Interpretation: The Religion of Ahab and Manasseh in the Book of Kings", *CBQ* 55 (1993) 653f.

⁽³⁹⁾ Einen vordtr Kern vermutet THIEL, "Dtr Redaktionsarbeit", 163f., denn "die Buße Ahabs widerspricht zu auffällig dem extrem negativen dtr. Urteil über Ahab. ... Ist es vorstellbar, daß die Deuteronomisten für den Prototyp des Götzendieners, Ahab, einen Bußakt schufen, der ihn mit Josia in eine Linie stellt...?". Dieser Eindruck zerstreut sich rasch bei einem Vergleich mit 2 Kön 22,19f.: Von der für Joschija entfalteten Emphase ist bei Ahab nichts zu spüren. Gerade weil Ahab die Verachtung des ersten Gebots personifizierte, mußten Deuteronomisten einen Grund für seinen friedlichen Tod finden.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Sofern es sich überhaupt um eine ältere Bildung handelt, was umstritten ist, weil die Kontexteinbindung von 19gh selbst Fragen aufwirft. In *MT* enthält der Vers eine Doppelung von Redebefehl und prophetischer Botenformel, die allerdings mit dem abweichenden Zeugnis von *G** zu vergleichen ist. Die vorausgehende Erzählung macht im Unterschied zu v.19

III. Schlußfolgerungen zu Werdegang und Funktion des DtrG

Wie wir sahen, verlangt die Bestimmung der Funktion von 1 Kön 21,27-29*, die folgende Erzählung von Ahabs Tod in 1 Kön 22,1-38 dem DtrG* abzusprechen. Dies hat — im Verein mit zusätzlichen Beobachtungen — ausgreifende Konsequenzen für die Entwicklungsgeschichte des DtrG im Bereich von 1 Kön 13–2 Kön 13. Sie können hier nur noch knapp umrissen werden⁽⁴¹⁾. Die Erzählung von Micha ben Jimla ist nach oben und unten mit weiteren Prophetengeschichten literarisch verzahnt. Ihr Anfang (1-2a) bildet einen geschlossenen Zusammenhang mit 1 Kön 20,35-43, einer Erweiterung, die die ehemals voneinander unabhängigen Aramäerkriegserzählungen 1 Kön 20* und 22* zu einem kleinen Zyklus vereinigte, indem sie den Tod des Königs in Kap. 22 als Strafe für die versöhnliche Entlassung Ben-Hadads in 20,34 hinstellte. Diese redaktionelle Klammer verrät allerdings exakt die Handschrift, in der die Geschichte von dem Gottesmann aus Juda und dem Propheten aus Bet-El in 1 Kön 13 abgefaßt ist. Mit jenem Kapitel teilt sie die Vorliebe für die Wendung בדבר יהוה (7mal in Kap. 13; 20,35) und die Präposition אצל (5mal in 13; 20,36); dazu den Löwen als Strafwerkzeug Jhwhs, was bis zu wörtlichen Übereinstimmungen reicht (vgl. 20,36 וילך ומצאהו האריה “er ging von ihm weg, und da fand ihn der Löwe” mit 13,24 וילך ומצאהו אריה “er ging weg, und da fand ihn ein Löwe”)⁽⁴²⁾. Die verbindenden Merkmale treten in Bündeln

gerade nicht Ahab, sondern Isebel für den Mord an Nabot verantwortlich, und wir hören nichts davon, daß die Hunde Nabots Blut geleckert hätten. Aufgenommen wird das Drohwort nur in 1 Kön 22,38, jedoch in deutlich sekundärer Weise, denn Elia ist nicht genannt, am Teich von Samaria hatten die Hunde gewiß nicht Nabots Blut geleckert, und von den “Huren” schweigt 21,19. Die literargeschichtlichen Einordnungen von 19gh gehen äußerst weit auseinander: Zum ältesten Kern der Erzählung rechnen das Drohwort z. B. STECK, *Überlieferung und Zeitgeschichte* 43; R. BOHLEN, *Der Fall Nabot*. Form, Hintergrund und Werdegang einer alttestamentlichen Erzählung (1 Kön 21) (TThSt 35; Trier 1978) 318; G. HENTSCHEL, “Die geschichtlichen Wurzeln der Eliajatraddition”, *Dein Wort beachten*. Alttestamentliche Aufsätze (Hrsg. J. REINDL) (Leipzig 1981) 37. Ein (offenbar separat) “überliefertes Prophetenwort” vermutet THIEL, “Dtr Redaktionsarbeit”, 162. Mit einem jüngeren Deuteronomisten (DtrP) rechnet W. DIETRICH, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 49f. Einen nachdtr Zusatz postuliert E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Könige*, 246.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Vgl. STIPP, *Elischa*, 361-480.

⁽⁴²⁾ Näheres ebd., 375-377.

auf, und zwar nur in diesen beiden Texten⁽⁴³⁾. Neben einer geprägten Wendung (בדבר יהוה) umfassen sie ganz individuelle Elemente (לֹוֹעַ Löwe, 13,24//20,36). Entgegen beliebten Annahmen ist auch festzuhalten, daß die Vorverweise auf die jorschijanische Reform in 1 Kön 13,2.32 auf literarischer Ebene nicht überzeugend aus ihren Kontexten herauslösbar sind⁽⁴⁴⁾, was bei einem derart von Südreichinteressen überformten Text nicht erstaunen kann. Der individuelle Grundzug der Gemeinsamkeiten, ihre Bündelung und enge Streuung sowie der Charakter von 20,35-43 als redaktionelles Bindeglied belegen, daß wir den Idiolekt eines Redaktors vor uns haben, der in Juda in Kenntnis der jorschijanischen Reform arbeitete⁽⁴⁵⁾, wobei er zumindest im Falle von 1 Kön 13 alte Überlieferungen verwertete, ihnen aber seinen persönlichen Stempel aufprägte.

Weil nun die Prophetenerzählungen in 1 Kön 13 und 20 (über den Anhang v.35-43) das Kap.22 voraussetzen, müssen auch sie jüngere Zuwächse zum DtrG darstellen. Es ist wohl der Autor von 1 Kön 13 und 20,35-43 gewesen, der Kap. 20* und 22* dem DtrG einverleibte. Die ursprüngliche Aufeinanderfolge der beiden Kriegserzählungen ist in *G** noch erhalten. In *MT* hat man Kap. 20 vor Kap. 21 gerückt, weil die militärischen Erfolge und die prophetische Unterstützung, die Ahab dort zuteil werden, nach dem Mord an Nabot zu anstößig erschienen⁽⁴⁶⁾.

⁽⁴³⁾ בדבר־י in 1 Kön 18,36 wurde erst durch Qere an den in 1 Kön 13 und 20,35 ausschließlich gebrauchten Singular angeglichen und hat kein Äquivalent in *G**.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Vgl. *Elischa*, 379-403.415-418. Dies gilt auch gegen die neueren Arbeiten von A.H.J. GUNNEWEG, "Die Prophetenlegende I Reg 13-Mißdeutung, Umdeutung, Bedeutung", *Prophet und Prophetenbuch* (FS. O. KAISER; [Hrsg. V. FRITZ -K.-F. POHLMANN -H.-C. SCHMITT] BZAW 185; Berlin-New York 1989) 73-81; A. IBAÑEZ ARANA, "El 'Hombre de Dios' y el Profeta de Betel (1 Re 13)", *Scriptorium Victoriense* 36 (1989) 5-76; E. EYNIKEL, "Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Deuteronomistic History (1 Kgs 13; 2 Kgs 23,16-18)", *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies. Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress Leuven 1989* (ed. C. BREKELMANS -J. LUST) (BETL 94; Leuven 1990) 227-237.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ W. THIEL, "Sprachliche und thematische Gemeinsamkeiten nordisraelitischer Propheten-Überlieferungen", *Die alttestamentliche Botschaft als Wegweisung* (FS. H. REINELT; [Hrsg. J. ZMIJEWSKI] Stuttgart 1990) 361-362, beurteilt die (nur zum Teil ausgewerteten) Übereinstimmungen im Sinne der Überschrift seiner Studie.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ GOODING, "Ahab", und BOGAERT, "Repentir d'Achab", führen dagegen die Kapitelfolge in *G** auf Korrektur zurück.

Nach unten hängt 1 Kön 22,1-38 durch die Hervorhebung Joschafats und wörtliche Übereinstimmungen eng mit 2 Kön 3,4-27 zusammen, einem Kapitel, das selbst schon wegen seiner Widersprüche zum dtn Kriegsgesetz und den dtr Rahmennotizen in 1 Kön 22,48 und 2 Kön 8,20 als Kandidat für einen nachträglichen Einbau aufgefallen war. In neuerer Zeit haben mehrere literarkritische Studien grundsätzliches Einvernehmen erzielt, daß die Gemeinsamkeiten aus einer Bearbeitung von 1 Kön 22 durch den Autor von 2 Kön 3 herrühren⁽⁴⁷⁾. Dann setzt auch 2 Kön 3,4-27 die Erzählung von Micha ben Jimla bereits voraus, und das vorläufige Urteil, 2 Kön 3 sei erst in einer späteren Phase ins DtrG eingegangen, bestätigt sich.

2 Kön 2, die Erzählung von Elisas Entrückung und Elischas ersten Wundern, ist wegen ihrer mangelnden Integration in das dtr Rahmengerüst kompositionsgeschichtlich verdächtig. Sie endet in v. 25b mit der "Rückkehr" (שוב) Elischas nach Samaria. Die Notiz stößt sich mit 25a, wo Elischa anscheinend folgenlos zum Karmel wandert, und mit dem ganzen Kapitel, weil sich Elischa dort nirgends in Samaria aufhält. Die Sachlage ist leicht zu erklären⁽⁴⁸⁾: 25a

(47) Vgl. H. SCHWEIZER, "Literarkritischer Versuch zur Erzählung von Micha ben Jimla (1 Kön 22)", *BZ NF* 23 (1979) 1-19; O. H. STECK, "Bewahrheiten des Prophetenworts. Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Skizze zu 1. Könige 22,1-38", "Wenn nicht jetzt, wann dann?" (FS. H.-J. KRAUS; [Hrsg. H.-G. GEYER – J. M. SCHMIDT – W. SCHNEIDER – M. WEINRICH] Neukirchen-Vluyn 1983) 87-96; STIPP, *Elischa*, 176-229. Bloß an Imitation von 2 Kön 3 denkt H. WEIPPERT, "Ahab el campeador? Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu 1 Kön 22", *Bib* 69 (1988) 457-479. — A. IBAÑEZ ARANA, "Miqueas Ben Yimlā y los cuatrocientos profetas (1 Re 22)", *Scriptorium Victoriense* 36 (1989) 225-277, und H. ROUILLARD, "Royauté céleste et royauté terrestre en 1 R 22", *Le Trône de Dieu* (éd. M. PHILONENKO) (WUNT 69; Tübingen 1993) 100-107, erneuern die andersartige Literarkritik von E. WÜRTHWEIN, "Zur Komposition von I Reg 22,1-38", *Das ferne und nahe Wort* (FS. L. ROST; [Hrsg. F. MAASS] Berlin 1967) 245-254 = DERS., *Studien zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, 178-187. — Gegenüber jeglichen Vorstufenrekonstruktionen zu 1 Kön 22 skeptisch ist H. J. TERTEL, *Text and Transmission. An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives* (BZAW 221; Berlin - New York 1994) 182-221.

(48) Vgl. SCHMITT, *Elisa*, 76f.; G. HENTSCHEL, *2 Könige* (NEB; Würzburg 1985) 11. Anders T. R. HOBBS, "2 Kings 1 and 2: Their unity and purpose", *SR* 13 (1984) 327-334.

verband die Erzählung einmal mit 2 Kön 4, wo Elischa auf dem Karmel wohnt (4,25.27). Diese Abfolge ist heute durch Kap.3 unterbrochen, was daran liegen muß, daß letzteres bei Aufnahme von 2 Kön 2+4 ins DtrG bereits dort vorhanden war. Denn Elijas Entrückung und Elischas Einsetzung zu seinem Nachfolger hatten ihren natürlichen Platz hinter der letzten Elija- und vor der ersten Elischaereinheit. Die Notwendigkeit zur Aufspaltung von 2 Kön 2+4 ergab sich nur, wenn erstens schon eine eng mit dem Vorderteil des Königsrahmens für Joram verhaftete Elischageschichte vorhanden war, wie es auf 2 Kön 3,4-27 zutrifft, und wenn man zweitens so wenig Text wie möglich außerhalb des Rahmenwerks einordnen wollte. Den Übergang zu 2 Kön 3 glättete dann die Glosse 2,25b, die Elischa nach Samaria führte, den Ausgangspunkt des Feldzugs der drei Könige (3,6). Die Prioritätsverhältnisse erweisen so 2 Kön 2 und 4 ebenfalls als jüngere Einbauten im DtrG, was bestätigt, daß die unerwartete Position von 2 Kön 2 in der Tat kompositionskritischen Zeugniswert besitzt.

Damit sind die Konsequenzen aus den obigen Überlegungen noch nicht erschöpft. 2 Kön 8,1-6 fußt auf der Erzählung von der Schunemiterin in Kap.4 und kann daher nicht früher ins DtrG eingegangen sein als jene. Die Verwandtschaft von 2 Kön 6,24-7,20 mit 1 Kön 20 ist eine wohlbekannte Tatsache⁽⁴⁹⁾. Die Feststellungen zur kompositionsgeschichtlichen Aussagekraft der regelwidrigen Position von 2 Kön 2 können auch für 2 Kön 13,14-25 nicht ohne Folgen bleiben. 2 Kön 5 offenbart Toleranzen gegenüber Götzenkulten, die hinter seine originale Zugehörigkeit zum DtrG ein deutliches Fragezeichen setzen. Dies wirkt sich aus auf die nächste größere Erzählung 2 Kön 6,8-23, mit der 2 Kön 5 verbunden ist durch den Ansatz eines Rahmens (5,2 "die Aramäer zogen in Streifscharen aus" — 6,23 "die Streifscharen der Aramäer kamen nicht mehr ins Land Israel"), den Gebrauch des Titels "Prophet" (statt "Gottesmann") für Elischa⁽⁵⁰⁾, das Stichwort "Prophet in Israel" (5,8;

⁽⁴⁹⁾ J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (1876/7, Berlin 41963) 285.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Vgl. sonst 2 Kön 3,11; 9,1.4. Die Belege von "Gottesmann" in 2 Kön 5 und 6,8-23 sind mit *G** als sekundär zu beurteilen; vgl. STIPP, *Elischa*, 6-46; N. C. BAUMGART, *Gott, Prophet und Israel*. Eine synchrone und diachrone Auslegung der Naamanerzählung und ihrer Gehasiepisode (2 Kön 5) (Erfurter Theologische Studien 68; Erfurt 1994) 11-13. Anders A.

6,12; vgl. sonst nur Dtn 34,10) und drei Fälle des im AT nur elfmal belegten Ausdrucks אָרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל (5,2.4; 6,23)⁽⁵¹⁾. Daß demnach auch diese Aramäerkriegsgeschichte nicht bereits durch die Schöpfer des DtrG* ihrem Werk inkorporiert wurde, überrascht nicht angesichts der freundschaftlichen Unterstützung, die Elischa hier dem König von Israel gewährt.

Nach alldem erweist sich die Notiz von Ahabs Buße und Strafaufschub als ein Schlüsselindiz für die Kompositionsgeschichte der umgebenden Kapitel in den Königsbüchern. Zusammen mit 22,40 dokumentiert sie den sekundären Status der Erzählung vom Tod Ahabs vor Ramot-Gilead im DtrG. 1 Kön 22* wird jedoch selbst von überraschend vielen anderen Prophetengeschichten vorausgesetzt, und zwar entweder direkt oder mittelbar, d.h. durch Voraussetzung von Texten, die ihrerseits nicht vor 1 Kön 22* ins DtrG eingegangen sein können. Die Untersuchung von 1 Kön 21,27-29 und weitere kompositionsgeschichtlich bedeutsame Beobachtungen konvergieren zu dem Schluß, daß ein großer Teil der Prophetenerzählungen in 1 Kön 13–2 Kön 13 erst nachträglich in das DtrG Eingang gefunden hat. Ursprünglich war das Werk in diesem Raum erheblich straffer und umfaßte vor allem die Erzählungen, die durch das Dynastiewort ein unverkennbares dtr Gepräge erhalten haben (1 Kön 14; 21; 2 Kön 9ff.) oder unlöslich in das dtr Rahmenwerk eingeschmolzen sind (2 Kön 1). Anhand der raschen Folge kurzlebiger Nordreichdynastien veranschaulichte es die Konsequenzen, die nach Meinung seiner Schöpfer die Mißachtung der Kultzentralisationsforderung und — noch schlimmer — des ersten Gebots zeitigen mußte. Die Propheten traten vor allem in Erscheinung, um den pflichtvergessenen Herrschern ihre Strafe anzusagen oder den Sturz einer Dynastie durch die Designation einer anderen in Gang zu setzen (9,1ff.). Weitere prophetische

LEMAIRE, "Joas, roi d'Israël, et la première rédaction du cycle d'Élisée", *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies*. Papers read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress Leuven 1989 (ed. C. BREKELMANS – J. LUST) (BETL 94; Leuven 1990) 253 mit Anm. 37.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Sonst nur 1 Sam 13,19; Ez 27,17; 40,2; 47,18; 1 Chr 22,2; 2 Chr 2,16; 30,25; 34,7. Vgl. Th. WILLI, "Die alttestamentliche Prägung des Begriffs אָרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל", *Nachdenken über Israel, Bibel und Theologie* (FS. K.-D. SCHUNCK; [Hrsg. H. M. NIEMANN – M. AUGUSTIN – W. H. SCHMIDT]) Frankfurt am Main u. a. 1994) 387-397.

Unterstützung für Nordreichkönige, wie sie jetzt wiederholt belegt ist, gab es nicht.

Diese Ergebnisse liefern einige Gesichtspunkte für die Frage nach dem Zweck des ursprünglichen DtrG*. Zunächst haben sie Folgen für die eingangs skizzierte Alternative zweier Hauptmodelle zu seinem Werdegang, insofern sie auf eine weitere Infragestellung des Schichtenmodells hinauslaufen. Denn die hier als spätere Zuwächse beurteilten Prophetenerzählungen sind frei von dtr Zügen, so daß es im untersuchten Bereich keinen Anlaß gibt, jüngere dtr Bearbeitungsschichten größeren Umfangs anzunehmen. Im Vergleich zur Analyse Dietrichs ergibt sich sogar ein nahezu gegenteiliges Bild: Während Dietrich u.a. "die meisten Eliageschichten" und "wahrscheinlich den gesamten Elisa-Zyklus" dem ursprünglichen DtrH zuschrieb, die durch das Dynastiewort zusammengehaltenen Texte dagegen dem jüngeren DtrP⁽⁵²⁾, erscheinen hier gerade die Belege des Dynastieworts als zentrale Strukturelemente der Urfassung, und die meisten übrigen Prophetenerzählungen stellen sich als spätere Einbauten heraus. Der Größe "DtrP", einer Hauptsäule des Schichtenmodells, entwindet so die Grundlage.

Dagegen lassen sich unsere Resultate mühelos mit einem Blockmodell in der Gestalt eines joschijanischen DtrG* kombinieren. Die Ausklammerung der als sekundär erkannten Erzähleinheiten bewirkt nämlich eine Konzentration der Darstellung auf die "Sünde Jerobeams", die kultische Apostasie und den Götzendienst des Nordreichs sowie deren Folgen. Dies würde ausgezeichnet passen zu einem Geschichtswerk, das vor allem als eine Werbe- und Warnschrift zur propagandistischen Absicherung der joschijanischen Reformen entworfen worden wäre. Das Beispiel Israels lieferte drastischen Anschauungsunterricht, wohin es führen mußte, wenn dem Anspruch Jhwhs auf Alleinverehrung an seiner erwählten Kultstätte der Gehorsam versagt blieb. Dafür haben die dtr Redaktoren aus dem zeitgenössischen Angebot an Erzählstoffen jedoch eine erheblich strengere Auswahl getroffen, als der heutige Zustand erkennen läßt.

⁽⁵²⁾ DIETRICH, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 134-148, Zitat 145. Vgl. auch R. SMEND, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart u.a. 1989) 122.

IV. Erwägungen zum Buchwesen in alttestamentlicher Zeit

Die vorstehenden Schlußfolgerungen erfordern die Vorstellung, daß das DtrG* gegenüber seinem ursprünglichen Zustand später noch gewachsen ist, was nach der Indizienlage obendrein in mehreren Schüben vonstatten gegangen sein muß. Wenn dies auf die Prophetenerzählungen der Königsbücher zutrifft, muß man naturgemäß in anderen Teilen des Werkes mit ähnlichen Vorgängen rechnen, und derartige Hypothesen gibt es ja genug. Das erscheint jedoch keineswegs abwegig, wenn man sich vergegenwärtigt, daß im Alten Testament nahezu die komplette ältere Erzählliteratur in einer einzigen Großkomposition vereinigt ist, nämlich den Büchern Gen–2 Kön, also Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk zusammengekommen. Hat man folglich damals neben diesen beiden Hauptwerken keine Erzählungen mehr geschaffen bzw. erhaltenswert gefunden? Fielen etwa Stoffe, die die Schöpfer von Pentateuch und DtrG aus Unkenntnis, theologischen Vorbehalten oder welchen Gründen auch immer nicht berücksichtigt hatten, damit automatisch der Vergessenheit anheim? Die radikale Konzentration der narrativen Memorabilien auf eine einzige Großkomposition muß gegenüber solchen Schlüssen skeptisch stimmen.

Die kompositionsgeschichtlichen Indikatoren in den Prophetenerzählungen in 1 Kön 13–2 Kön 13 deuten in eine andere Richtung. Anscheinend war das DtrG* zunächst weniger umfangreich als M. Noth glaubte, nahm aber im Verlauf seines allmählichen Zugewinns an Autorität den Rang eines sicheren Hafens für weitere literarische Materialien an. Wollte man solchen Lesestoffen Dauerhaftigkeit und Öffentlichkeitswirkung verschaffen, war der natürliche Weg, sie dem angesehenen und sorgfältig gepflegten Hauptwerk einzuverleiben. Die Möglichkeit dazu lag in den Händen von Personen, die Zugriff auf das Werk besaßen, es in Ehren hielten, studierten und für seine Erhaltung sorgten. Die aufgrund der gebrauchsbedingten Abnutzung der Schriftrollen von Zeit zu Zeit erforderliche Herstellung einer neuen Kopie bot Gelegenheit, zusätzliche Materialien oder Retuschen einzuflechten. N. Lohfink hat ein bedenkenswertes Panorama dieser Art israelitischen Buchwesens entworfen, wo ein entsprechend gerüsteter und interessierter Kreis ein werdendes biblisches Buch unterhielt und periodisch aktualisierte⁽⁵³⁾. So kann man sich einen

(53) N. LOHFINK, "Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?", *Jere-*

Reim darauf machen, wie es kommt, daß ein erheblicher Teil des AT auf hochkompliziert geschichtete Großkompositionen wie den Pentateuch⁽⁵⁴⁾, das DtrG oder die Bücher Jesaja und Jeremia entfällt. Welcher Hypothese zu deren Werdegang auch immer ein kritischer Forscher heute folgen mag, er wird nicht um die Annahme einer komplexen Genese herumkommen.

Solche Überlegungen erlauben es, sich das Zustandekommen der heutigen Befundlage in 1 Kön 13–2 Kön 13 auszumalen. Dort wurde eine Anzahl von Erzählungen bzw. Erzählkränzen sukzessiv in den jeweils älteren Bestand eingebettet. Dabei handelt es sich teilweise um Stücke, die keinen Grund bieten zu zweifeln, daß sie schriftlich vorlagen und praktisch unverändert übernommen wurden. In anderen Fällen legen Unselbständigkeit, Anknüpfung an andere Texte oder die Technik der Einpassung nahe, daß die betreffenden Erzählungen erst beim Hineinschreiben ins DtrG ihre vorfindliche Gestalt erhalten haben. Ein Musterbeispiel ist die Kombination 1 Kön 13 + 20,35-43. Dann sind die exilisch-nach-exilischen Autoren dieser Fassungen mit ihren schriftlichen Vorlagen freier umgegangen, oder sie haben aus einer noch lebendigen Erzähltradition geschöpft. Mit einer solchen muß man rechnen, gleichgültig, ob man den Einbau vorformulierter Stücke oder Neuformulierungen erklären will. Denn es ist schwer vorstellbar, daß unter damaligen Umständen Geschichten, deren Hintergrund auch noch auf das Nordreich weist, möglicherweise Jahrhunderte rein archivalisch überdauerten, dann aber ins DtrG eingereiht wurden, ohne daß ein entsprechendes Interesse, das sich auch in Erzählpraxis niederschlug, ihre Bewahrung sicherstellte. Allein die Tatsache, daß solche Texte bzw. Stoffe entweder den Redaktoren des DtrG* Ende des 7. Jahrhunderts oder späteren Ergänzern zur Verfügung standen, verlangt die Annahme eines ihren Erhalt sichernden Verwendungszusammenhangs. Was Neuformulierungen angeht, ist da-

mia und die "deuteronomistische Bewegung" (BBB 98; [Hrsg. W. GROSS] Weinheim 1995) 313-382; darin die Abschnitte "IV. Was waren eigentlich 'Bücher' in biblischer Zeit?" und "V. Gibt es Zusammenhänge zwischen Textgestalt und 'Bewegungen'?" (335-349).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Man vergleiche nur, wieviel späte Zusätze im Pentateuch der zu Recht vielbeachtete Entwurf von E. BLUM annehmen muß: *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin-New York 1990) 361-382.

her die Unterscheidung zwischen dem traditionsgeschichtlichen und dem literarischen Alter dieser Stücke unerläßlich.

Department of Ancient
Near Eastern Studies
University of Stellenbosch
Stellenbosch, 7599
South Africa

Hermann-Josef STIPP

SUMMARY

The notice about Ahab's penance and the postponement of his punishment in 1 Kgs 21,27-29 creates a paradox. On the one hand Ahab is the sole recipient of the oracle addressed to the dynasty, whose punishment is postponed. On the other hand he is the only one who actually suffers the punishment (1 Kgs 22,38). This taken together with 1 Kgs 22,40 ("sleeping with his ancestors") supports the thesis that 1 Kgs 22,1-38 was not yet present in the original DtrG*. The interdependence of the prophetic stories in 1 Kgs 13-2 Kgs 13 as well as further observations make it probable that a majority of these texts entered DtrG only later. This would favour the block model for the origin of the DtrG as opposed to the layers model and points to its original function as a prospectus and warning notice which served as propaganda to accompany Josiah's reform.

Does Luke Also Portray Jesus As the Christ in Luke 4,16-30? ⁽¹⁾

D.L. Tiede concludes, "Attempting to decide whether Jesus' 'anointing' in Luke 4 is essentially royal-Davidic or prophetic-Mosaic proves, therefore, to be at least risky and probably futile" ⁽²⁾. However, for some scholars it must be "essentially" prophetic-Mosaic; for they interpret the anointing of Jesus in Luke 4,18 only in terms of his being a prophet ⁽³⁾. Nonetheless, Tiede's statement well introduces the problematic of this article, for many other scholars likewise see a reference to Jesus as "the Christ" or, at least, identify Luke 4,18-19(16-30) as messianic ⁽⁴⁾. Are these latter scholars accurate in their interpretation of Luke's thought;

⁽¹⁾ This article was in the final stages of preparation when M.L. Strauss' *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSS 110; Sheffield 1995) appeared. Yet the data and approach of the present article are sufficiently diverse that publication seems warranted.

⁽²⁾ D.L. TIEDE, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia 1980) 46; cf. 17,55.

⁽³⁾ E.g., see J.-N. ALETTI, *L'Arte di raccontare Gesù Cristo* (Brescia 1991) 40-53, 81-83, 93; I. DE LA POTTERIE, "L'onction du Christ. Étude de théologie biblique", *NRT* 80 (1958) 231-234; C. ESCUDERO FREIRE, Jesús profeta, liberador del hombre. Visión lucana de su ministerio terrestre", *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 51 (1976) 463-464, 476-495; C.F. EVANS, *Saint Luke* (London 1990) 266, 269; J.A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX* (AB 28A; Garden City, NY 1981); 529-530, 532; D. HILL, "The Rejection at Nazareth (Luke iv 16-30)", *NT* 13 (1971) 169, 178-179; B.-J. KOET, "'Today This Scripture Has Been Fulfilled in Your Ears'. Jesus' Explanation of Scripture in Luke 4,16-30", *Bijdragen* 47 (1986) 375-377; J.S. SIKER, "'First to the Gentiles': A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30", *JBL* 111 (1992) 74, 82-86, 89-90. J. KODELL, "Luke's Gospel in a Nutshell (Lk 4: 16-30)", *BTB* 13 (1983) 17, accepts a vague expression of Jesus' messiahship but sees the emphasis as on him as God's ultimate prophet. I.H. MARSHALL (*The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*) (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1978, 183) feels that ultimately the concepts of the eschatological prophet and the Messiah merge.

⁽⁴⁾ A number of scholars so understand the passage although at times they provide only a brief defense of their position, e.g., R.L. BRAWLEY,

and if so, how well can such understanding be defended? The present article offers a more reasoned and thorough defense of the interpretation that Luke views Jesus as the Christ in Luke 4,18-19(16-30)⁽⁵⁾. Particular attention will be paid to Luke-Acts since that consideration is what needs further development⁽⁶⁾. The importance of Jesus' identity in 4,16-30, which most scholars grant is programmatic for Luke-Acts⁽⁷⁾, is obvious since this portrayal would influence the whole of Luke-Acts.

Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation (SBLMS 33; Atlanta 1987) 12-13; cf. 19; W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin 1971) 120-121; L. T. JOHNSON, *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina 3; Collegeville, MN 1991) 79, 81; W. S. KURZ, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, KY 1993) 15, 138, 150; P. D. MILLER, "An Exposition of Luke 4:16-21", *Int* 29 (1975) 417-421; M. PRIOR, "Isaiah, Jesus and the Liberation of the Poor", *Scr* 24 (1994) 40-41, cf. 37. F. SCHNIDER, *Jesus der Prophet* (OBO 2; Göttingen 1973) 165-166, 189; E. SCHWEIZER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen 1982) 58; H. SCHÜRMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium I: Kommentar zu Kap 1,1-9,50* (HTKNT 3; Freiburg 1969) 229-230; R. C. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts, A Literary Interpretation: Vol. I: The Gospel according to Luke* (Philadelphia 1986) 63, although his reference to Luke 1,32-35 appears less applicable to 4,18-19. D. L. BOCK, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern. Lucan OT Christology* (JSNTSS 12; Sheffield 1987) 109-111 contends that the insertion of Isa 58,6 demonstrates that Jesus is portrayed as the Messiah. R. FABRIS, "Lo Spirito Santo sul Messia (Lc 3,21-22; 4,1.14.16-20)", *Parola, spirito e vita* 4 (1981) 108-111, speaks of Jesus as the Messiah in a prophetic context, and J. D. KINGSBURY, "Jesus as the 'Prophet Messiah' in Luke's Gospel", *The Future of Christology* (ed. A. J. Malherbe & W. A. Meeks) (Minneapolis 1993) 31, 34, contends that Luke does not use "prophet" as a christological title, rather Jesus is the "prophetic Messiah".

⁽⁵⁾ For a description of the overall research done on this pericope from 1973-1988, see C. J. SCHRECK, "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4,16-30 in Recent Study", *L'évangile de Luc* (ed. F. Neirynck) (Leuven 1989) 399-471, esp., 440.

⁽⁶⁾ Thus far, the three scholars who have reflected most on this question are: U. BUSSE, *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu: Eine Einführung in das lukanische Jesusbild nach Lk 4,16-30* (SBS 91; Stuttgart 1978) 68-77; M. L. STRAUSS, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 245-247, 250-260 and TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity*, 63, 67-68. See also J. DUPONT, "Jésus annonce le bonne nouvelle aux pauvres", *Études sur les évangiles synoptiques* (BETL 70/1; Leuven 1985) 42-51, 60-80; W. C. VAN UNNIK, "Jesus the Christ", *NTS* 8 (1961-1962) 113-114.

⁽⁷⁾ E.g., R. ALBERTZ, "Die 'Antrittspredigt' Jesu im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund", *ZNW* 74 (1983) 182-206;

The scholars who see a reference only to Jesus as prophet point out that the OT citations used in vv. 18-19 come from the prophet Isaiah (61,1-2; 58,6), who is explicitly named in v. 17. Also, in this passage Jesus indirectly identifies himself as a prophet in v. 24, "No prophet gains acceptance in his native place"⁽⁸⁾, and compares himself to two other OT prophets, Elijah and Elisha (vv. 25-27). Some scholars also view Jesus as the Servant of Yahweh (Suffering Servant) in vv. 18-19⁽⁹⁾, and this contention proves convincing. The identification of the Servant of Yahweh hymns occurred comparatively recently, and Luke himself may well have regarded Isa 58,6 and 61,1-2 as part of this theme since he was acquainted with Isa 42,1 (cf. Luke 3,22; 9,35; 23,35) of which ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν mirror the Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὐ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με of Isa 61,1. In addition, C. Stuhlmüller notes that in Isa 61,1-7 we have a

J.-N. ALETTI, "Jésus à Nazareth (Lc 4,16-30). Prophétie, Écriture et typologie", À cause de l'Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes (LD 123; Paris 1985) esp. 439; H.J.B. COMBRINK, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 4:16-30", *Neot* 7 (1973) 39-41; J. COPPENS, *Le messianisme et sa relève prophétique. Les anticipations vétérotestamentaires. Leur accomplissement en Jésus* (BETL 38; Leuven 1989) 188; A. del AGUA PÉREZ, "El cumplimiento del Reino de Dios en la misión de Jesús: Programa del Evangelio de Lucas (Lc 4,14-44)", *EstB* 38 (1979/1980) 269-294; P. F. ESLER, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Melbourne 1987) 34; G. MANGATT, "'The Acceptable Year of the Lord' (Lk 4:16-30)", *Bible Bhashyam* 9 (1983) 179; P. D. MILLER, "Luke 4:16-21", 417; W. RADL, *Das Lukas-Evangelium* (ErFor 261; Darmstadt 1988) 43; M. RODGERS, "Luke 4:16-30 - A Call for a Jubilee Year?", *Reformed Theological Review* 40 (1981) 81; A. SISTI, "Il tema del giubileo nell'opera di Luca", *Euntes Docete* 37 (1984) 11-12, 30. But see SCHRECK, "The Nazareth Pericope", 441-442, 448-449.

⁽⁸⁾ F. O'FEARGHAIL, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts: A Study of the Role of Lk 1,1-4,44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work* (An Bib 126; Roma 1991) 24-25, lists a number of scholars who hold for this unity. See also DEL AGUA PÉREZ, "El cumplimiento del Reino de Dios", 271-273; ESCUDER FREIRE, "Jesús profeta", 468-473; SCHÜRMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 221; TANNEHILL, *Unity of Luke-Acts: I*, 60; M. VÖLKE, "Zur Deutung des 'Reiches Gottes' bei Lukas", *ZNW* 65 (1974) 63.

⁽⁹⁾ See D. L. BOCK, *Prophecy and Pattern*, 108-109; E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia 1975) 64. G. W. H. LAMPE ("The Lucan Portrait of Christ", *NTS* 2 [1955-1056] 168-170) and W. RUSSELL ("The Anointing with the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts", *Trinity Journal* 7 [1986] 47-63) see a reference in these verses to Jesus as Prophet, the Servant and the Christ.

soliloquy as in the second and third Servant hymns, a mission of mercy as in Isa 42,2-4.6-7 and a year of favor as in Isa 49,8⁽¹⁰⁾. The present article grants that Jesus is surely viewed as a prophet and very likely also as the Servant of Yahweh in Luke 4,16-30, but contends that these identifications are not yet the whole Lucan picture.

Even though at first there appears to be little evidence, other than ἔχρισεν (Luke 4,18), that Luke in his programmatic passage presents Jesus as the Christ as well as a prophet and the Servant of Yahweh, in fact, there are a number of good reasons to conclude that he does. To show this, we will employ composition criticism which is a form of redaction criticism and considers Luke as the final composer of Luke-Acts and contends that his final composition can be studied. We begin with a few suppositions and a brief consideration of the bearing of non-NT literature on Luke's meaning in 4,18-19, then study Luke 4,16-30 itself and how Luke generally presents Jesus as the Messiah ("the Christ") and, finally, consider some significant parallels to Luke 4,18-19(16-30).

What are our suppositions? The study of titles of Jesus has undergone considerable criticism, some of this has surely been justified. In the case of Lukan studies, the study of titles for Jesus proves even more challenging since he is willing to predicate many of the same things of Jesus under one title or another. Yet the contention that the Lucan titles have lost any individual import remains more a theory than an established fact. Moreover, as I have suggested in a different context, for Luke Jesus as "the Christ" includes his being "king" and "of Davidic lineage" and so the concepts of "kingdom", "reign", "seated on the throne" and can even embrace "Son of God" and "the Son of Man"⁽¹¹⁾. Since the Gospel of Mark, with its "messianic secret", was one of the sources of Luke, it should come as no surprise that Luke himself, in the beginning chapters of his Gospel, might be somewhat moderate in so identifying Jesus. Finally, no solid proof exists that Luke knew either Hebrew or Aramaic.

⁽¹⁰⁾ C. STUHLMUELLER, "Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah", *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R. E. Brown; J. A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Murphy) (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1990) 346. See also MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke*, 183; SECCOMBE, "Luke and Isaiah", *NTS* 27 (1980-1981) 255-256; STRAUSS, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 239-243.

⁽¹¹⁾ "The Kingdom of God in Luke-Acts", *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation* (ed. W. WILLIS) (Peabody, MA 1987) 147.

I. Bearing of Non-NT Literature on the Understanding of Luke 4,18-19.

Naturally, Luke's OT citations in Luke 4,18-19 need to be considered. Thus far, the efforts to prove anything from a supposed Jewish lectionary cycle have not proved fruitful⁽¹²⁾. Moreover, the composite citation does not depend on how scriptures were then read in a synagogue; rather the composite goes back to Jesus himself or, more likely, to Luke who in Acts adjusts OT citations to his context or theological concerns⁽¹³⁾. Isa 58,6, cited in Luke 4,18, originally formed part of a reflection on true and false fasting (vv. 1-14), united by the contrast between Israel's desire and that of Yahweh, between piously afflicting oneself with fasting and neglecting the afflicted⁽¹⁴⁾; yet there is no reason to view Isa 58,1-14 as messianic. On the other hand, Isa 61,1-2 forms part of the restoration of Jerusalem (chs. 60-62) which section of Trito-Isaiah is the closest in spirit and vocabulary to Deutero-Isaiah⁽¹⁵⁾. Nonetheless, although 61,1-2 resemble the Servant of Yahweh hymns and 11,2 associates the reception of the spirit with the Davidic messiah, Isa 60-62 do not appear to be particularly messianic; but one might argue that, since the Jews could conceive of the messianic only in terms of what they knew and experienced, the restoration of Jerusalem would have suggested the Messiah to them⁽¹⁶⁾. This suggestion would remain only theoretical, did we not

(12) L. C. CROCKETT, "Luke 4:16-30 and the Jewish Lectionary Cycle: A Word of Caution", *JJS* 17 (1966) 13-46; FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX*, 531.

(13) COMBRINK, "The Structure and Significance", 34-35; M. RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gütersloh 1969) 144-147, 153-154. But see B. D. CHILTON, "Announcement in Nazara: An Analysis of Luke 4:16-21", *Gospel Perspectives II* (ed. R. T. FRANCE and D. WENHAM) (Sheffield 1981) 163-168.

(14) M. L. BARRÉ, "Fasting in Isaiah 58:1-12: A Reexamination", *BTB* 15 (1985) 94-97. See also G. J. POLAN, *In the Ways of Justice toward Salvation: A Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 56-59* (American University Studies VII/13 (New York 1986) 241-242; S. SEKINE, *Die Tritojesanische Sammlung (Jes 56-66) redaktionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (BZAW 175; Berlin 1989) 130-131.

(15) STUHLMEUILLER, "Trito-Isaiah", 345-346.

(16) P. GRELOT's ("Sur Isaïe LXI: La première consécration d'un grand-prêtre", *RB* 97 [1990] 414-431) contention that originally Isa 61,1-3 constitute the speech of a high priest following his anointing and solemn

now know that Isa 61 enjoyed a certain popularity in the Judaism at the time of Jesus⁽¹⁷⁾. Two fragments from Qumran, 11QMelch and 4Q521, connect Isa 61,1-2 with the Messiah. The first of these, 11QMelch, has come to us in a very fragmentary form yet contains expressions which bear on an understanding of Luke 4,18-19. M. DeJonge and A.S. van der Woude observe, "11QMelch connects the expressions המבשר, ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος and המשיח, ὁ χριστός in the context of a quotation from Isa. lii. 7 and an interpretation of that text which is clearly influenced by Isa lxi. 1f⁽¹⁸⁾". This fragment also speaks of the last and tenth jubilee year, the liberty and freedom of those in exile, and identifies Melchizedek, the heavenly deliver, as he who brings good news and is anointed by the spirit from whom he speaks (line 18: (והמבשר הנאה מ[שיח הרוח] אשר אמר ⁽¹⁹⁾). Consequently, as Luke 4,18-19, 11QMelch is influenced by Isa 61,1-2, speaks of salvation, preaching the good news, being anointed by the Spirit and of a jubilee year which seems definitive. Moreover, it also clearly speaks of the Messiah as the divine agent of these events; but as A. del Agua Pérez rightly observes⁽²⁰⁾, unlike 11QMelch, Luke already sees the fulfilment of scriptures in the beginning of Jesus' activity.

Just recently published, 4Q521 is a Hebrew copy from between 100 – 75 B.C. of an earlier manuscript; one of the fragments

investiture may be correct. However, our question is: How did Luke understand it; and there is no evidence that he sees Jesus as high priest in Luke 4, 18-19.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See J. A. SANDERS, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4", *Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (Leiden 1975) I, 75-106, esp. 80-95, and his "Isaiah in Luke", *Int* 36 (1982) 152.

⁽¹⁸⁾ M. DEJONGE and A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament", *NTS* 12 (1965-1966) 309; cf. 301-312. For the *editio princeps*, see A.S. VAN DER WOUDE, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösgestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle", *OTS* 14 (1965) 360-366. See also O. BETZ, "The Kerygma of Luke", *Int* 22 (1968) 135-137; É. PUECH, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle* (ÉB n.s. 22; Paris 1993) II, 516-526; B. REICKE, "Jesus in Nazareth — Luke 4,14-30", *Das Wort und die Wörter* FS. G. FRIEDRICH (ed. H. Balz – S. Schulz) (Stuttgart 1973) 49; J. SCHMITT, "L'oracle d'Is LXI,1ss et sa relecture par Jésus", *RevScRel* 54 (1980) 97.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Ibid.*, 302-303.

⁽²⁰⁾ DEL AGUA PÉREZ, "El cumplimiento del Reino de Dios", 276.

contains fourteen lines, two of which are of particular interest to us⁽²¹⁾. Both of these lines have been influenced by Isa 61,1. Line 8, "He will release the captives, make the blind see, raise up the do(wntrodden)", strongly resembles part of Luke 4,18, "He has sent me ... to proclaim liberty to captives, recovery of sight to the blind and to let the oppressed go free" (cf. Isa 61,1). Moreover, line 12, "Then he will heal the sick, resurrect the dead and announce good news to the poor", bears a strong resemblance to Luke 7,22 (cf. Isa 61,1) which speaks of Jesus' healing of a number of illnesses and ends with "dead men are raised to life, and the poor have the good news preached to them". Below, we will see that 7,18-23 are an obvious parallel to 4,18-19(16-30). Yet line 1 of 4Q521 explicitly speaks of God's Messiah, and the rest of the fragment relates what God will do for the pious. Consequently, both 11QM^{elch} and 4Q521 view Isa 61,1-2 as a messianic passage. To be sure, we are not sure to which messiah, Davidic, priestly or prophetic, these two fragments are referring; and all that we can realistically claim is that they witness to a messianic interpretation of Isa 61,1-2 contemporary with Luke and to that extent favor such an understanding of Luke 4,18-19.

II. What Can Be Learned from Luke 4,14-30 Itself?

A. *The Unity of Luke 4,16-44*

Any claim that Luke also views Jesus as the Christ in Luke 4,16-30 will naturally have to attend to the meaning of "anointing" in Luke 4,18, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me (οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με) to bring good news to the poor". Yet the whole pericope proves significant in determining Luke's understanding. There is a unity to Luke 4,16-30; nonetheless, Luke has also stressed the unit, 4,14-44, because we find summaries of Jesus' teaching and preaching at both the beginning and end of the pericope (vv. 14-15: καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν; v. 44: καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας) as

(21) E. PUECH, "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)", *RevQ* 15 (1992) 484-495, 514-519. See also his *La croyance des Esséniens* II, 627-644, 663-681; M. O. WISE and J. D. TABOR, "The Messiah at Qumran", *BAR* Nov./Dec. (1992) 60-65.

well as the following vocabulary: ἐξῆλθεν (v. 14), ἦλθεν and εἰσῆλθεν (V. 16), ἐξελθών (v. 42); ἡμέρα (vv. 16, 42), συναγωγή (vv. 15-16, 44; cf. 20,28,33,38), the scripture citation in vv. 18-19 corresponds to the divine will expressed in δεῖ (v. 43), εὐαγγελίσασθαι (vv. 18, 43), ἀποστέλλω (vv. 18[2x], 43), κηρύσσω (vv. 18-19, 44). Furthermore, τοῦ πνεύματος (v. 14) is reflected in the πνεῦμα of v. 18. Luke first presents the programmatic passage, properly speaking, and then Jesus begins to actualize it. Two aspects of this larger unit are of interest. When Jesus heals all the sick who were brought to him, demons come out of many of them and shout, “‘You are the Son of God!’ He rebuked them and did not allow them to speak because they knew that he was the Christ” (v. 41)⁽²²⁾. Obviously, in this verse, “the Son of God” means the same as “the Messiah (Christ)”, and Jesus is realizing his mission, “to let the oppressed go free” (v. 18). So, in accord with our contention that ἔχρισεν in 4,18 points to Jesus as the Christ (Messiah), Luke in v. 41 so identifies him. In v. 43, with obvious reference to vv. 18-19, Jesus explains that he was sent (ἀπεστάλην) to preach the good news (εὐαγγελίσασθαι) of the kingdom of God. What according to vv. 18-19 Jesus is to proclaim is now summarized as “the kingdom of God”⁽²³⁾. Certainly, Jesus need not be the Christ to make this proclamation, but it corresponds well with our contention that Luke in vv. 18-19 so describes him.

B. Baptismal Phraseology.

Granted that we are dealing with an OT citation, nonetheless, the phrasing of Luke 4,18 reminds one of Christian baptism (Luke 3,15-17.21-22; Acts 2,38-41; 10,36-38.47-48; 11,15-17; cf. 9,17-19a; 22,13-16); there is the presence of the Holy Spirit, the indication of a mission and some expression of salvation.

1. Luke 3,15-17

Luke 3,15-17 is relevant here; for although Jesus, implicitly identified as the Christ, is the one baptizing; nevertheless, our present emphasis is rather on the phrasing of Christian baptism.

⁽²²⁾ This article follows the translation of the *NAB*, unless for some reason that translation be judged incorrect. Then the translation is my own.

⁽²³⁾ BETZ (“The Kerygma of Luke”, 137-138) has recognized this Lucan connection between Jesus as Messiah and the kingdom.

What we do not explicitly find in Luke 4,18-19 is some mention of Jesus as Christ. However, only Luke (3,15-17; cf. John 1,24; Acts 13,22-25; 19,4-6) among the Synoptics reports the concern of the people about John the Baptist's being "the Christ" or not. John the Baptist then moves on to distinguish his baptism in water from that of the one more powerful and more important than himself who will baptize in the "Holy Spirit and in fire" (cf. Luke 12,49-50). Luke 3,15-17 implicitly joins Jesus as "the Christ" with baptism in the Holy Spirit. So, like Luke 4,18-19 and its context, 3,15-17 uses baptismal phraseology and connects the Holy Spirit with Jesus and the requisite response to him; but it implies further that Jesus is "the Christ".

2. Luke 3,21-22

Just a few verses later (Luke 3,21-22) Jesus' own baptism occurs in which he does not explicitly appear as "the Christ"; but "You are my Son" (v. 22; cf. Ps 2,7; Acts 13,33) suggests such an identification. Most scholars grant a connection between Luke 3,21-22 and 4,18-19; for the theme of prayer like the scriptural citations remind us that God directs the activity and in both scenes the Spirit acts on Jesus and there is a mission. "Beloved" in the OT designates Isaac in the scene where Abraham is ordered by Yahweh to offer him as a burnt offering (Gen 22,2; cf. vv. 12,16; Luke 20,13)⁽²⁴⁾ and so looks to a total openness to God's will, even to the point of sacrificing one's life. Quite clearly, "With you I am well pleased" refers to the Hebrew text of the first Servant of Yahweh hymn (Isa 42,1; cf. Luke 9,35; 23,35)⁽²⁵⁾. Jesus will carry out the task of the servant. Now, the second part of Isa 42,1, "Upon whom I have put my Spirit" (ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν) and reminds one of Luke 4,18. What authors do not always note but definitely merits attention is that in 3,15-17.21-22, Luke first associates Jesus as "the Christ" with baptism and faith in him and then in the scene of Jesus' baptism he clearly speaks of Jesus as the Servant of Yahweh. Seemingly, he takes both of these titles up again in 4,18-19(16-30).

⁽²⁴⁾ Luke drops ἀγαπητός at the Transfiguration (9,35; cf. Mark 9,7).

⁽²⁵⁾ Yet it does not follow that Luke himself knew Hebrew.

3. Acts 2,38-41

Acts 2,38-41 also parallel Luke 4,18-19. After the Pentecost speech, Peter's audience is deeply moved and asks what they should do. Peter tells them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ so that their sins can be forgiven and they can receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (v. 38). This verse presents in narrative fashion four aspects of baptism: repentance, physical act of baptism, and the resultant forgiveness of sins and reception of the gift of the Spirit⁽²⁶⁾. Peter continues, "Save yourself from this generation which has gone astray". As in Luke 4,18-19, we have baptismal phraseology, the gift of the Spirit and notice of salvation; but the baptism is in the name of Jesus Christ. At first, one might want to explain "Christ" as just a fuller naming of Jesus; but in view of our consideration of Luke 3,15-16, such an interpretation appears less probable.

4. Acts 10,47-48 and 11,15-17

This association of Jesus as "the Christ", the Holy Spirit, baptism and Jesus' mission appears again in Acts 10,38, but this passage will be treated below in our consideration of ἔχρισεν in Luke 4,18. Later in the same chapter (Acts 10,47-48), Luke again speaks of reception of the Spirit and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. Acts 11,15-17 repeats this description and makes direct reference to Luke 3,15-16 (cf. Acts 1,5) and describes the original recipients of Pentecost as believing in "the Lord Jesus Christ". Relevant to the present discussion is the association found in these passages between reception of the Spirit and the designation, "Jesus Christ".

C. How Understand ἔχρισεν in Luke 4,18?

The importance Luke attributes to Luke 4,18-19 is shown by Tiede's structure⁽²⁷⁾ as modified by Siker⁽²⁸⁾:

⁽²⁶⁾ See my "Christian Baptism in Luke", *Review for Religious* 39 (1980) 855-865.

⁽²⁷⁾ *Prophecy and History*, 35.

⁽²⁸⁾ "First to the Gentiles", 77. See also ALETTI, "Jésus a Nazareth (Lc 4,16-30)", 433-435; COMBRINK, "The Structure and Significance", 28-31; R. MEYNET, *L'évangile selon Saint Luc* (Paris: 1988) I, 42.

- A. v. 16 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν... εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ...
 B. καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι.
 C. v. 17 καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον ...
 D. καὶ ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον
 E. vv. 18-19 πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ ...
 D'. v. 20 καὶ πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον
 C'. ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ
 B'. ἐκάθισεν
 A'. καὶ ... ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ...

Surely, Luke calls attention to his citations in vv.18-19. However, Siker does well not to accept Tiede's structure of vv.18-19; and the arrangement of the text of these particular verses suggested by Tannehill proves more helpful⁽²⁹⁾. For the scope of this article, it is important that the grammar of vv.18-19 not be overlooked. As the text presently stands, vv.18-19 constitute one sentence⁽³⁰⁾. A form of εἰμί has to be understood with "The Spirit of the Lord *is* upon me"; this clause is followed by the relative οὗ governed by the improper preposition, εἵνεκεν. Most reasonably, οὗ εἵνεκεν, which should be translated as "because"⁽³¹⁾, functions as a subordinating conjunction whose clause has two main verbs, ἔχρισεν and ἀπέσταλκεν. The rest of the sentence consists in four infinitival phrases the first of which might well be governed by "he anointed"; otherwise all of them are governed by "he has sent". Consequently, the main idea in these verses is the Spirit of the Lord's presence with Jesus⁽³²⁾, which presence is explained by "he (the Lord) anointed me (cf. Acts 10,38)", and "he has sent me", whose thought is completed by the four infinitival phrases. In a sense, the rest of the pericope flows from the Lord's anointing and sending of Jesus.

Above we noted that many scholars not unreasonably interpret Luke 4,18 prophetically because it is a citation from Isaiah and

⁽²⁹⁾ *Narrative Unity*, 62.

⁽³⁰⁾ Some authors want to place some punctuation after με; others after πωχοῖς. MARSHALL (*The Gospel of Luke*, 183) observes that the former punctuation agrees with that of the MT and LXX and fits with Luke's interpretation of the quotation in Luke 4,43; see also DUPONT, "Jésus annonce", 28-29. However, neither punctuation would significantly effect the argument being presented here.

⁽³¹⁾ COPPENS, *Les messianisme*, 188-189.

⁽³²⁾ COMBRINK ("The Structure and Significance", 31, 41) recognizes this but regards the Spirit as that of prophecy.

because Jesus later in the passage indirectly identifies himself as a prophet and compares himself to two ancient prophets (vv.24-27). However, ἔχρισεν comes from the verb, χρίω, from which also derives the title, Χριστός, and so it could very naturally likewise point to Jesus as the Christ. Already in the OT, we find this relation between “anointing” and “Spirit”, precisely with reference to kings (1 Sam 10,1-7.10; 16,13)⁽³³⁾. To be sure, our question is how did Luke himself understand “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; therefore he has anointed me”. Luke only uses χρίω three times, and all three usages related to Jesus.

1. Acts 4,27

Luke’s understanding of χρίω is best determined by a study of its use in Acts 4,27 where he interprets Ps 2,1-2 in terms of Jesus, “Indeed, they gathered in this very city against your holy Servant, Jesus, whom you anointed (ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ἔχρισας)—Herod and Pontius Pilate in league with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel”. One should not take “Servant” here as a reference to the Servant of Yahweh because that is what occurs in ch. 3 (vv. 13, 26; cf. Isa 52,13); for such an interpretation fails to notice that David in 4,25 is referred to as “our father David your servant” (τοῦ πατρὸς ... Δαυὶδ παιδός σου; cf. Luke 1,69) to which Jesus’ identification as τὸν ἅγιον παῖδα σου in v.27 surely corresponds⁽³⁴⁾. Thus the phrase, κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, in the Davidic and messianic Ps 2,1-2 cited in Acts 4,25-26 is fulfilled in Jesus whom God anointed and who during his passion is opposed by both Jews and Romans. Since Acts 4,25-30 constitute the only instance in which Luke clarifies how he wants to use χρίω of Jesus, it is reasonable to claim that in Luke 4,18 through his use of the word Luke, although in the context he designates Jesus as a prophet, likewise thinks of him as “the Christ”. The opposition to Jesus reported in Acts 4,25-27 compares well with Jesus’ fellow citizens violent rejection and effort to hurl him over the edge of the hill (cf. Luke 4,24-29).

⁽³³⁾ VAN UNNIK, “Jesus the Christ”, 114. Cf. 1 Kgs 1,34.39.45; 2 Kgs 11,12; Ps 2,2.

⁽³⁴⁾ SECCOMBE, “Luke and Isaiah”, 255. See also RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 148.

2. Acts 10,38

The only other verse in which Luke writes of Jesus' being anointed is Acts 10,38. Surely, Acts 10,38 resembles and refers back to Luke 4,18 and its phraseology may well have been influenced by Isa 61,1-2⁽³⁵⁾; for it reads, "Of the way God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power (ὥς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει). He went about doing good works and healing all who were in the grip of the devil, and God was with him". Like Luke 4,18, Acts 10,38 uses baptismal phraseology and relates Jesus' being anointed by the Holy Spirit and his salvific mission to the disadvantaged. Acts 10,37 mentions John's baptism; v.36 calls Jesus, "Jesus Christ" and "Lord", and describes salvation as peace; and vv.34-35 speak of universality (cf. Luke 3,15-17; 4,25-27). Naturally, the designation, "Jesus Christ", supports our contention that Luke likewise saw in χρίω (Luke 4,18) a reference to Jesus as Christ.

D. Does the Other Vocabulary in Luke 4,18-19 Tell Us Anything?

Surely, Luke 4,18-19 consist in two OT citations⁽³⁶⁾; yet other than χρίω, these verses contain vocabulary which, when compared with Luke's elsewhere, suggests that he was also thinking of Jesus as the Christ when he cited these verses. Below special attention will be given to 7,18-23.

1. Πτωχός and τυφλός

Elsewhere, in Luke-Acts Luke does not associate πτωχός with Jesus as a prophet, unless one wants to argue for a portrayal of Jesus as Moses in the teaching of the beatitudes (Luke 6,20); even then, it would be only indirectly. However, in the parable of the great banquet, an image of the messianic banquet, the Lord instructs his servant to lead in the poor and the blind (Luke 14,21). In our discussion of the baptismal phraseology of 4,18-19, we observed that Acts 9,17-19a and 22,13-16 relate Paul's recovery of sight to his baptism. In his Gospel, when the blind man near Jericho learns that

⁽³⁵⁾ DUPONT, "Jésus annonce", 46-51.

⁽³⁶⁾ Of course, SISTI ("Il tema del giubileo", 15) is correct when he states that Luke has adapted Isa 61,1-2 to his theological concerns. In the final analysis, any OT citation serves the author's purposes.

Jesus of Nazareth is passing, he shouts, “Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me”; and when those in the lead try to quiet him, all the louder he cries the same thing. Jesus orders him brought to him and ask what he wants; and he answers, “I want to see”. Jesus then gives him his sight and tells him that his faith has saved him (18,35-43: τυφλός τις... Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ Δαβίδ, ἐλέησόν με... Ὑιὲ Δαβίδ, ἐλέησόν με... ἵνα ἀναβλέψω... Ἀνάβλεψον... ἀνέβλεπεν). Luke in this story draws a clear connection between Jesus as the Christ, “Son of David”, and sight to the blind (cf. 4,18: τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεπιν).

In the story of Emmaus the eyes of the disciple are opened and they recognize Jesus in the breaking of bread (24,31), but only a few verses earlier (vv. 25-26), Jesus had identified himself as the Christ who fulfilled all the scriptures and had to suffer to enter his glory. Another metaphorical use of “open the eyes” occurs in Acts 26,18 where the risen Jesus describes Paul’s mission to the people and the nations, “To open the eyes of those to whom I am sending you, to turn them from darkness to light ... that through their faith in me they may obtain the forgiveness of their sins and a portion among God’s people”. However, Paul carries out a mission which, a few verses later, Luke predicates of Jesus as the Christ, “That the Christ ... will proclaim light to our people and to the Gentiles” (v. 23). “To open the eyes” in these passages means to lead someone to salvation; and it is associated with the activity of Jesus as Christ. So, Luke in a number of passages associates the notion of “recovery of sight to the blind” with Jesus as Christ.

2. Ἀφῆσις

Ἀφῆσις occurs twice in Luke 4,18, “liberty to captives” and “freedom for the oppressed”; and a number of scholars have observed that the insertion of the second phrase from Isa 58,6 is best explained by Luke’s desire to re-emphasize this word⁽³⁷⁾. In the LXX, the word is certainly related with the jubilee year (cf. Lev 25,8-17.30-33.40-43.47-55; 27,23-24). Of the ten appearances of “liberty” or “freedom” in Luke-Acts, other than the two in 4,18, it always deals with liberation from sin⁽³⁸⁾. This observation needs

⁽³⁷⁾ See COMBRINK, “The Structure and Significance”, 36; KOET, “Today This Scripture”, 372-373; MILLER, “Luke 4:16-21”, 420; RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 146; TANNEHILL, *Unity of Luke-Acts: I*, 65.

⁽³⁸⁾ PRIOR, “Isaiah, Jesus”, 41-42.

to be taken a step further, for in almost all of the instances which associate forgiveness of sins with Jesus, he appears as "Christ" in the context. Luke 1,78 speaks of "knowledge of salvation in freedom from their sins", but this refers the reader back to v. 69 which speaks of the mighty savior God has raised in the house of David. According to Luke 24,47, it is in the name of the Christ that penance and forgiveness of sins are to be preached to all the nations. At the end of the Pentecost speech, Peter tells his audience that each of them should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ that their sins may be forgiven and they might receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2,38). Later, Peter ends his speech in Cornelius' house with the proclamation that those who believe in Jesus have forgiveness through his name (Acts 10,43), yet v. 36 reads, "This is the message he has sent to the sons of Israel, the good news of peace proclaimed through Jesus Christ who is Lord of all". Acts 13,38 reports Paul's assertion, "You must realize, my brothers, that it is through him that the forgiveness of sins is being proclaimed to you, including the remission of all those charges you could never be acquitted of under the law of Moses. However, vv. 33-37 (cf. Ps 2,7; Isa 55,3LXX; Ps 15,10LXX) speak of Jesus as the descendent of David. Finally, the risen Jesus' description of Paul's universal mission, noted above, contains the words, "To open the eyes of those to whom I am sending you, to turn them from darkness to light ... that through their faith in me they may obtain the forgiveness of their sins and a portion among God's people" (Acts 26,18). Yet a few verses later Luke also predicates this mission of Jesus as Christ, "that the Christ ... will proclaim light to our people and the Gentiles" (v. 23). So, ἄφεσις in Luke 4,18 most probably looks to the forgiveness of sins, which Luke attributes to Jesus as "Christ".

3. "A Year of Favor from the Lord" (Luke 4,19)

How did Luke want his reader to understand "a year of favor⁽³⁹⁾ from the Lord" and does that expression assist us in determining whether Luke views Jesus as the Christ in Luke 4,18-19? Some scholars want to take this reference to the jubilee year

(39) For this meaning and a thorough consideration of δεκτός, see J. BAJARD, "La structure de la péripécie de Nazareth en Lc IV,16-30" *ETL* 45 (1969) 168-169.

literally⁽⁴⁰⁾; but thus far that interpretation has not convinced many others, although most would grant that themes associated with the jubilee year appear in Luke 4,16-30. On the other hand, C. F. Evans is surely correct when he states that Luke 4,19 is a summary of the previous statements (cf. v.18)⁽⁴¹⁾. Moreover, Luke's play on the word, δεκτός, as a description both of the jubilee year (v. 19) and of the prophet not acceptable in his hometown (4,24) hints that one's reaction to Jesus is also their reaction to the message of the jubilee year⁽⁴²⁾. Likewise, the above proposed translation, "year of favor" or "year of grace" naturally leads us to the amazement of Jesus' audience at the "words of grace which came out of his mouth"⁽⁴³⁾. What Jesus reads and says are words of grace, of God's favorable activity, that should be accepted as should be the prophet who proclaimed them.

Two other considerations, the Markan parallels to Luke 4,18-19(30) and the temporal nature of "year", suggest much the same meaning for "a year of favour from the Lord". The rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Mark 6,1-6a) is certainly a parallel; but for our purposes Mark 1,14-15, Jesus' coming into Galilee, his proclamation of the good news of God and saying, "This is the time of fulfillment. The reign of God is at hand! Reform your lives and believe in the gospel", proves more productive. This passage is not only a parallel; but as we saw in our study of the larger unit, 4,14-44, Luke himself summarizes 4,18-19 as preaching the good news about the kingdom of God (v.43)⁽⁴⁴⁾. "Time of fulfillment"

⁽⁴⁰⁾ E.g., S. H. RINGE, *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee* (OBT 19; Philadelphia 1985); R. B. SLOAN, *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubiliary Theology in the Gospel of Luke* (Austin 1977). See also A. STROBEL, "Die Ausrufung des Jubeljahres in der Nazarethpredigt Jesu. Zur apokalyptischen Tradition Lc 4,16-30", *Jesus in Nazareth* (ed. W. ELTESTER) (Berlin 1972) 38-50. For a summary of much of the discussion, see SCHRECK, "The Nazareth Pericope", 450-453.

⁽⁴¹⁾ C. F. EVANS, *Saint Luke* (TPI NT Commentaries; Philadelphia 1990) 271. See also GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 121. SLOAN, *The Favorable Year*, 32, notes that this is the opinion of most scholars.

⁽⁴²⁾ See ALETTI's (*L'Arte di raccontare Gesù Cristo*, 43, n. 16) corrective of Bajard's understanding of δεκτός in Luke 4,25.

⁽⁴³⁾ J. L. NOLLAND ("Words of Grace", *Bib* 65 [1984] 44-60) argues convincingly that here Luke explains the situation to his reader and that "grace" points to a divine influence, conceived as a quasi-substantial power.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ See RADL, *Das Lukas-Evangelium*, 132.

likewise helps to explain “a year of favor from the Lord”, as does the concept of “kingdom of God”, because it points to a definite period in salvation history. In Luke 7,28, Jesus says of John the Baptist, that no one born of woman is greater than he, “Yet the least born in the kingdom of God is greater than he”. So, Luke draws a distinction between John the Baptist and the kingdom of God, and this distinction appears again in 16,16, “The law and the prophets were in force until John. From his time on, the good news of God’s kingdom has been proclaimed, and people of every sort are forcing their way in”. It is to this new beginning marked by the proclamation of the good news of the kingdom that “a year of favor from the Lord” points; and for Luke this begins with Jesus⁽⁴⁵⁾.

The temporal aspect “year” directs our attention to other Lucan passages which associate this new beginning with Jesus as Christ. Luke only uses δεκτός three times⁽⁴⁶⁾, and one of these instances leads us back to a passage that we have already seen is quite similar to Luke 4,18-19, i.e., Acts 10,34-43. After Peter states that anyone who fears God and acts rightly is acceptable (δεκτός), he goes on to speak of the message that God has sent to Israel, “the good news of peace proclaimed through Jesus Christ who is Lord of all” (v. 36). This period that begins with Jesus’ earthly preaching of the gospel message, summarized as peace⁽⁴⁷⁾, squares well with the

(45) BUSSE, *Das Nazareth-Manifest*, 36, 62-63; H. CONZELMANN, *The Theology of St. Luke* (New York 1961) 20-27, 101, 112, 160-161. COPPENS, *Le messianisme*, 189-191; F.W. DANKER, *Jesus and the New Age* (Philadelphia 1988) 102; HILL, “The Rejection”, 168-169, 177; MANGATT, “The Acceptable Year of the Lord”, 185; MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke*, 184; D. MONSHOUWER, “The Reading of the Prophet in the Synagogue at Nazareth”, *Bib* 72 (1991) 94, 97; RODGERS, “Luke 4:16-30”, 79-82; SIKER, “First to the Gentiles”, 82-83; TANNEHILL, *Unity of Luke-Acts*, 63, 68. See also W.J. HOUSTON, “‘Today in Your Very Hearing’. Some Comments on the Christological Use of the OT”, *The Glory of Christ in the NT*. Memorial G. B. Caird (Oxford 1987) 46-47.

(46) Luke 4,19.24; Acts 10,35; NT 5x. See SCHRECK, “The Nazareth Pericope”, 448.

(47) Several other passages support this interpretation; but since they do not speak of Jesus as Christ or use an equivalent expression, they are less useful for our present discussion. At the miracle of the son of the widow of Naim, the people see Jesus as a great prophet and conclude that God has visited his people (Luke 7,16); later Jesus tells the crowds, “You hypocrites! If you can interpret the portents of earth and sky, why can you

contents and claim of “the year of favor from the Lord” in of 4,18-19. Significantly, Acts 10,36 associates this message with “Jesus Christ”. Three passages, already noted as similar to Luke 4,18-19(30), do the same. In the *Benedictus* Zechariah praises the God of Israel because he has visited and ransomed his people and raised up a horn of saving strength in the house of David his servant (1,68-68), a few verses later (v.78), he calls Jesus the dawn from on high that will visit us (v.78). Immediately following his triumphal entry into Jerusalem as the king who comes in the name of the Lord, Jesus weeps over the city of Jerusalem and predicts its fall, “because you failed to recognize the time of your visitation” (19,44)⁽⁴⁸⁾. Paul at the beginning of his speech in the synagogue in Pisidia Antioch speaks of several periods in Israel’s story of salvation. He introduces the last period with a reference to David from whose descendants God has raised up the savior Jesus. John the Baptist preceded him with his message of a baptism of repentance but realized that he was not worthy to unfasten the sandals on his feet (Acts 13,22-25; cf. 3,15-17). Finally, at the Jerusalem Council, James agrees with Peter’s claim that God has chosen a people from the Gentiles and cites Am 9,11-12LXX and its promise that God will return and rebuild the fallen house of David in order that the rest of humankind and all nations over whom his name has been called might seek him (Acts 15,13-17). Some scholars see in this passage two stages of salvation history, first the restoration of the house of David, then the reception of the Gentiles. Whether that be the case or not, we are dealing with a period of salvation history which begins with Jesus and to which Luke was pointing when he wrote, “a year of favor from the Lord” (Luke 4,19). So, Luke has often

not interpret the present time” (12,56); in the parable of the tenants, there is the moment of sending the son who is rejected and killed (20,13-16); the requirements for an apostles are being with Jesus from the baptism of John till the ascension (Acts 1,21-22). Acts 17,26 says of God, “Who set limits to their epochs”; and according to vv. 30-31 God has overlooked past periods when human beings did not know him, but now he calls on everyone to reform their lives because he has determined the day of judgment through Jesus.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ R. MADDOX *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. RICHES) (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh 1982) 133-134, has suggested that for Luke “visitation” may have the same meaning as “a year of favor from the Lord” (Luke 4,19).

enough associated this new period of salvation, "this year of favor from the Lord" with Jesus as Christ or descendent of David.

III. How Luke Presents Jesus as "the Christ" Elsewhere in Luke-Acts

A. *What the Reader Knows up to Luke 4,18*

A study of how Luke presents Jesus as "the Christ" elsewhere can help us determine whether he so wants to present him in Luke 4,16-30. Even though the Infancy Narrative may very well have been added later, as the text presently stands, the reader (as Theophilus) upon reaching Luke 4,18-19 is well aware that Jesus is the Christ, the descendant of David, who is associated with baptism in the Spirit, yet will be rejected by some of his own people. Jesus' reputed father, Joseph, is of the house of David (Luke 1,27; 2,4; 3,23.31); and Jesus will reign forever on the throne of David his ancestor (2,32-33), for God has raised up a mighty savior in David's house (1,69). Jesus, the Christ, Lord and savior is born in the city of David (2,11; cf. v. 4). Simeon was told by the Holy Spirit that he would not die before he had seen the Christ of the Lord, and this is fulfilled when he holds that baby Jesus in his arms (2,26; cf. vv. 27-32). When the people are wondering if John the Baptist is the Christ, he speaks of Jesus as the stronger one who will come after him and baptize in the Holy Spirit and fire (3,15-17). At his baptism, Jesus is addressed as "You are my son (3,22; cf. Ps. 2,7)" which elsewhere is joined to his being David's descendent (Acts 13,33; cf. vv. 32-37). The contrast with Caesar Augustus (2,1-11) and the refusal of Satan's offer of universal dominion in the second of Jesus' temptations (4,5-8) likewise suggest a unique royal power⁽⁴⁹⁾.

B. *Luke 9*

Luke is not satisfied with the identification of Jesus as a prophet. Elsewhere⁽⁵⁰⁾, I have discussed the structure of Luke 9,1-50 and how Herod's question in v. 9b about Jesus' identity, "Who is this man about whom I hear all these reports", look to further and more acceptable answers. Twice the ordinary people

⁽⁴⁹⁾ See O'FERGHAIL, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts*, 131-135.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ "Luke's Message in Luke 9:1-50", *CBQ* 49 (1987) 74-89.

identify Jesus with one of the prophets (vv. 7b-8,19), but that answer is not satisfactory. Luke with step-parallelism introduces Peter's answer, Τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (v.20) which is acceptable but not totally so because a few verses later the voice from the cloud (God) more correctly proclaims of Jesus, "This is my Son, my Chosen One. Listen to him" (v.35; cf. 1,35). Actually, Jesus himself also corrects Peter's answer. He does not say that Peter's answer is wrong; in fact, he orders the disciples to tell no one about it, and this command probably originally hinted at the confusion and political misunderstanding which would result from such an identification. Peter's answer fails to embrace totally how Jesus is the Christ; for it does not reckon with his being the *suffering* Christ (v.22). Consequently, a study of Luke 9,1-50 allows us to conclude the following about 4,18-19(16-30). Luke is not satisfied with the identification of Jesus as prophet and sees "The Christ of God" as a good corrective. Of course, this raises the question whether Luke in his programmatic passage wanted to present Jesus as only a prophet. However, since Luke was cautious about spreading abroad Jesus' identification as the Christ in ch. 9, he may very well have done the same thing in 4,16-30; he implies it with ἔχρισεν rather than explicitly states it⁽⁵¹⁾. Finally, the rejection and threat of death present in the programmatic passage corresponds well with Jesus as the suffering Christ.

C. Other Aspects of Luke's Presentation of Jesus as Christ

Three other aspects of Luke's presentation of Jesus as Christ might support the contention that Luke wants his reader so to view Jesus in Luke 4,18-19(16-30). Luke does not often cite Sacred Scripture to show that Jesus is a prophet (cf. 4,18-19; 19,45; Acts 3,22-23; 7,37; cf. Luke 9,35). However, he very frequently cites the OT to show that Jesus is the Christ or how he is the Christ⁽⁵²⁾. So, the scripture citations in Luke 4,18-19 could support our claim of a Lucan reference to Jesus as Christ in these verses.

If Jesus' escape from the attempt of his fellow citizens to hurl him over the edge of the hill, "But he went straight through their

⁽⁵¹⁾ BUSSE (*Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu*, 75-76) has also observed that Luke in his Gospel makes only restrained reference to Jesus as the Christ.

⁽⁵²⁾ Luke 2,30-32; 19,38; 20,41-44; 22,69; 24,25-27.44-48; Acts 2,24-36; 3,18-21; 4,25-27; 9,22(?); 13,22-25.33-37; 15,14-17; 17,3; 18,5(?).28; 26,22-23; 28:23; cf. v. 31.

midst and continued on his away" (Luke 4,30) points to his resurrection⁽⁵³⁾, we would have yet another hint that Luke intends to portray Jesus as Christ in this pericope. Normally, one does not escape injury when he walks through the midst of an extremely hostile mob. Even if examples of such events appear in comparative literature, in a Christian context such an occurrence calls for a religious explanation. Although I would still hold that the prophetic statements about Jesus in ἀνίστημι (Acts 3,22.26; cf. 26,23), his exodus (cf. 9,51, ἀνάλημψις) and glory at the Transfiguration (9,29-32; cf. v. 26) and in being "leader of life" (Acts 3,15) look to his resurrection⁽⁵⁴⁾, nonetheless, Luke much more obviously connections Jesus' resurrection with his being Christ⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Most scholars grant that the programmatic passage (Luke 4,16-30) is parallel to Pentecost and Paul's speech at Pisidia Antioch⁽⁵⁶⁾. These scenes present the first major speech of Jesus, Peter and Paul respectively. However, both Pentecost and Paul's speech at Pisidia Antioch give a prominent place to Jesus as Christ (cf. Acts 2,25-36; 13,22-23.32-39).

IV. Does the Rest of Luke-Acts Help Our Understanding of Luke 4,16-30?

A. Luke 2,25-35

The presentation of Jesus in the temple (Luke 2,25-35) proves of considerable interest because it parallels Luke 4, 18-19(16-30) in a number of interesting ways: the Spirit plays a significant role in both scenes, and each provides a programmatic description of Jesus

⁽⁵³⁾ See J. DRURY, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (London 1976) 88; SCHWEIZER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 59. FRANKLIN (*Christ the Lord*, 143-144) sees in this verse a reference to Jesus' glorification and exaltation.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ See my "Some Observations on Anistēmi, 'I Raise', in Acts 3:22,26", *ScEs* 31 (1979) 85-92 and "The Parallels between Jesus and Moses", *BTB* 20 (1990) 22-28.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Luke 22,66-71; 23,39-43; 24,26.46; Acts 2,24-36; 3,6.18-21; 4,10.33; 9,34; 10,48; 13,33-37; 16,18; 17,3; 26,22-23.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ E.g., see L. T. JOHNSON, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. D. J. HARRINGTON) (Sacra Pagina 5: Collegeville, MN 1992) 236-238 and R. F. O'TOOLE, "Parallels between Jesus and His Disciples: A Further Study", *BZ* 27 (1983) 195-196.

whose salvific mission is recapitulated through citations from Isaiah and described in terms of light in the first story and in opening the eyes of the blind in the second, which concepts Luke elsewhere joins (cf. Acts 26,18.23), and these summary statements stir up amazement. Finally, Jesus' mission is universal and will be opposed by his fellow citizens⁽⁵⁷⁾. Certainly, there are differences between the two pericopes; but depending on when one holds that the Infancy Narrative was written, Luke seemingly modelled the presentation scene on that of Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth or vice versa. However, in the former the nomenclature of Jesus Luke emphasizes is clear from v.26, "It was revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he would not experience death until he had seen the Christ of the Lord". Did Luke in this passage derive his emphasis on "the Christ" from what he had already written about Jesus' proclamation in the synagogue at Nazareth or did he state explicitly in the presentation scene what he also held to be true in his programmatic passage? Perhaps, it is more important to ask: would a reader who has read the presentation of Jesus in the temple be able to read the scene in the synagogue and the *ἔχρισεν* in 4,18 without thinking of Jesus as the Christ?

B. Luke 7,18-23

The parallel between Luke 4,18-19(16-30) and 7,18-23 is obvious. The key to understanding if the latter passage assists us in determining whether Luke in the former is referring to Jesus as Christ lies in establishing the meaning of "Are you 'He who is to come (*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*)' or are we to expect someone else" (7,19)⁽⁵⁸⁾? If *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* in these latter verses refers to Jesus as the Christ, Luke would be revealing in 7,18-23 what was part of his meaning of *ἔχρισεν* in 4,18⁽⁵⁹⁾. Luke alone repeats the question of the Baptist's

⁽⁵⁷⁾ One could also mention that at least a parent appears in each scene; both scenes take place in a building dedicated to Jewish religious purposes.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ On this topic, see P. GRELOT, "'Celui qui vient' (Mt 11,3 et Lc 7,19)", *Ce Dieu qui vient: Mélanges offerts à Bernard Renaud* (LD 159; Paris 1995) 280-287. However, I have reservations about some of his conclusions.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ RESE (*Alttestamentliche Motive*, 153-154) astutely observes that apparently Luke did not originate the application of Isa 61,1-2 to Christ; rather it was probably suggested to him by "Q" (cf. Luke 7,22; Matt 11,5). See also DUPONT, "Jésus annonce", 67-79, esp. 73.

disciples and reports Jesus' miraculous activity at that moment, especially, in terms of giving sight to the blind (vv. 20-21). However, both Luke (v. 22) and Matthew (11,4) represent this miraculous activity as how Jesus answers the question of the disciples of John the Baptist. In other words, this miraculous activity which recalls 4,18 (cf. Isa 35,5; 61,1) demonstrates whether Jesus is "He who is to come". Moreover, since 7,18-23 deals with Jesus' present activity, we are not interested in Luke's use of *ἐρχομαι* in the distant future⁽⁶⁰⁾; thus the relevant Lucan passages are: Acts 3,16 (cf. 13,22-25); 7,34 (cf. 19,10); 13,35; 19,38.

1. Luke 3,15-17 and Acts 13,22-25

The baptismal phraseology of Luke 3,15-17 (cf. 12,49-50; Acts 19,4-6) has already played a part in our argumentation; but now we address the statement, "But there is one to come who is mightier than I" (v. 16). John the Baptist here answers the implied question of the people who were wondering if he might be the Christ. Given this context, the most natural understanding would be that the "one to come" is a description of the Christ. This interpretation is supported by Acts 13,22-25 which parallels Luke 3,15-17, yet speaks of Jesus, the one who comes after John the Baptist, as David's descendant and savior⁽⁶¹⁾.

2. Luke 13,35 and 19,38

Furthermore, in Luke 13,35 we read in Jesus' address to Jerusalem, "You shall not see me until the time comes when you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord'". Although Jesus just spoke about Jerusalem who slays the prophets, it is not at all clear that this blessing has to do with Jesus as a prophet. Rather it looks forward to his triumphal entry into Jerusalem and to the shouts of the whole crowd of disciples, "Blessed is he who comes as king in the name of the Lord" (19,38; cf. 17,20-21)⁽⁶²⁾ where only Luke has inserted "king" and so made explicit the reference to

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Most of these relate to Jesus as Son of Man; see Luke 9,26; 12,35-48; 18,8; 19,13; 20,16; 21,17; 22,18; Acts 1,11; 2,20; 3,20.

⁽⁶¹⁾ W. RADL (*Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk: Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte*, Frankfurt/M 1975, 94-100) has demonstrated the parallel structure between Luke 4,16-30 and Acts 13,14-52.

Jesus as king. So, "He who is to come" in 7,19 belongs to the theme of Jesus as the Christ and together with the description of his miraculous activity parallels Luke 4,18-19 and justifies our contention that ἔχρισεν likewise pictures Jesus as Christ. In fact, for Luke the kingdom of God is associated with the poor (6,12) and the blind (14,21) and with Jesus' miracles (8,1-3; 9,1-2; 10,9; 13,10-21)⁽⁶²⁾.

A possible objection could be that the "He who is to come" regards the Son of Man because the unity is Luke 7,18-35 which both begins and ends with a reflection on John the Baptist and Jesus. V. 34 reads, "The Son of Man came (ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) and he ate and drank...", and looks to a present activity (cf. 19,10). However, Luke regularly identifies Jesus as Son of Man when speaking of Jesus' suffering, death, resurrection and second coming—not with his miraculous activity as is done in 7,21-22 the parallels of which, 3,16; 13,35 and 19,38, definitely refer to Jesus as Christ.

Conclusion

Using composition criticism, this article offers a more reasoned and thorough defense of the interpretation that Luke also views Jesus as the Christ in Luke 4,18-19(16-30). Neither Isa 58,6 nor 61,1-2 in their original contexts are messianic. The latter certainly was prophetic and, given the rest of Isaiah, able to be understood of the Servant of Yahweh. However, two Qumran fragments, 11QMelch and 4Q521, contemporary with Luke, do relate Isa 61,1-2 to a messiah.

The "anointing" of Luke 4,18 is of particular importance in determining whether we have a reference to Jesus as Christ or Messiah. The unity of Luke 4,14-44 shows that Luke in these verses views Jesus as the Christ who proclaims the kingdom of God, and other Lucan passages which share the baptismal terminology of 4,18 connect Jesus with the Christ. The chiasmic structure of Luke 4,16-20 highlights the significance of 4,18-19 while a grammatical consideration of these latter verses underlines the presence of the Spirit through whom God anoints and missions Jesus. The rest of Luke 4,16-30 really flows from this anointing. In Acts 4,27 Luke clearly uses χρίω of Jesus as the Christ, and an analysis of Acts 10:38 and its context support such an understanding of this verb. Other

⁽⁶²⁾ See EVANS, *Saint Luke*, 565.

⁽⁶³⁾ See my "The Kingdom of God", 152, 155, 160 and "Some Exegetical Reflections on Luke 13,10-17", *Bib* 73 (1992) 90-100.

vocabulary in Luke 4:18-19 back up the claim that in these verse Luke not only wants to portray Jesus as a prophet but also as the Christ. Elsewhere in Luke-Acts, Luke associates "the poor", the recovery of sight for the blind" and the forgiveness of sins with Jesus as Christ. The year of favor or grace from the Lord is not to be taken literally as the jubilee year but rather as an image for God's grace and the new beginning, the period of salvation, marked by the proclamation of the good news of the kingdom of God and by the activity of Jesus, both prophet and Christ.

When Luke's readers arrive at Luke 4,18, they are already well aware that Jesus is the Christ. In fact, Luke's organization of ch. 9 of his Gospel shows that he is not satisfied with identifying Jesus as only a prophet, even though in his first volume he is restrained in designating him as Christ. On the other hand, Luke most cites the Sacred Scripture to establish Jesus as Christ and to point to his suffering and resurrection.

Luke 2,25-35 parallels 4,16-30 in a number of interesting ways, and the two scenes may have been modelled on one another. Could one who has read the former scene not also think of Jesus as the Christ in the latter? Luke 7,18-23 parallels 4,18-19 and likewise looks to his present activity, and the key phrase in the former passage, "He who is to come", looks to Jesus as Christ and king as Luke 3,15-17; 13,35; 19,38; cf. Acts 13,32-35 demonstrate. Consequently, there is good reason to hold that in Luke 4,18-19(16-30), Luke not only views Jesus as a prophet and Servant of Yahweh, but also as Christ⁽⁶⁴⁾.

Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Robert O'TOOLE, S.J.

SUMMARY

This article uses composition criticism and argues from Luke's two volumes themselves that he views Jesus as Christ in Luke 4,18-19(16-30). Naturally, the "anointing" of Luke 4,18 proves particularly important in this investigation; but the unity of 4,14-44, passages that share the baptismal terminology of 4,18 and the chiasmic structure of 4,16-20 also support the above interpretation. The use of *χρίω* in Acts 4,27, an analysis of Luke 2,25-35; 7,18-23; 9 and of Acts 10:38, together with the vocabulary of Luke 4,18-19, likewise favor this understanding. In fact, when the reader arrives at Luke 4,18, he is already well aware that Jesus is the Christ.

(64) STRAUSS (*The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 244-249) provides a summary of the import of each of these titles.

ANIMADVERSIONES

The Theological Assessment of the First Christian Persecution: The Apostles' Prayer and Its Consequences in Acts 4,24-31

In the Acts of the Apostles, the first detailed episode following the events of Pentecost is the cure of the crippled beggar by Peter in the area of the Temple in Jerusalem. This event occasions a speech by Peter in Solomon's Portico, which in turn becomes the cause of Peter and John's being arrested by the Jewish authorities. On the following day, Peter and John are questioned and warned that in the future they should never again teach ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. The two apostles then return to the assembly of the other apostles⁽¹⁾ and report what had been told to them. The six verses of Acts 4,24-30 then report the response of the gathered apostles and the events which immediately follow it⁽²⁾. The passage constitutes the prayerful

(1) The Greek here is πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους (literally: "to the(ir) own"). There is some dispute about who is intended here. Some would see it as the inner circle of apostles; others would see it as the community as a whole — or at least a segment of it. J. DUPONT, "La prière des apôtres persécutés", in *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LD 45; Paris 1967) 521-522, provides a survey of earlier positions on both sides of the question.

The majority of more recent commentators seem to take it as referring to a larger group from within the early community. E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ET; Philadelphia 1971) 226, rightly remarks that it cannot be intended to mean the entirety of the early community (which could hardly fit into one room). R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Zürich/Neukirchen 1986) 175, argues for a similar position. G. KRODEL, *Acts* (Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament; Minneapolis 1986) 112, also favors seeing it as a reference to more than just the apostles.

On the other hand L. T. JOHNSON, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville 1992) 84, 90, argues that the "literary logic" demands that the phrase refer to the inner circle of apostles.

DUPONT ("Prière") examines the issue most thoroughly and provides convincing parallels that the inner circle of the apostles is the group intended. He argues that "boldness" (vv. 29.31) "working signs and wonders" (v. 30) and "speaking your word" (vv. 29.31) are qualities and duties which are consistently associated elsewhere in Acts with the apostolic circle rather than with the community as a whole. Thus the prayer and experience of the Spirit are evidently presented as witnessed only by the apostles.

(2) The passage has had a mixed reception among commentators. H. CONZELMANN, *Acts of the Apostles* (ET; Philadelphia 1986) 34-35, attributes minimal importance to the passage, referring to it simply as "a transition to the summary which follows". Several scholars have called attention to the parallels to Jewish prayer forms (and particularly to Isa 37,16-20) in the passage: D. RIMAUD, "La première prière liturgique dans le livre des Actes (Actes 4,23-31)", *MD* 51 (1957) 99-115; S. CIPRIANI, "La preghiera negli Atti degli Apostoli", *BeO* 13 (1971) 27-41; L. MONLOUBOU, "La prière selon saint Luc. Recherche d'une structure", *LD* 89

response of the apostles to the first persecution and also constitutes the longest group prayer in Acts. Because of this, the passage takes on some importance for the theological outlook of Acts.

It is the purpose of this article to point out the careful way in which both the prayer and the consequences of that prayer are arranged and presented by the author of Acts⁽³⁾. This arrangement of the material confirms the importance of the prayer for Luke and demonstrates in detail the emphasis presented by him in his theological assessment of the persecution and its aftermath.

The Proposal of Benigno Papa

In the first volume of his commentary on Acts, Benigno Papa⁽⁴⁾ attempted to describe the structure of the passage as a chiasmically arranged central prayer (vv. 24b-29), surrounded by an introduction (vv. 23-24a) and a conclusion (v. 31). The introduction and conclusion do not figure in the concentric arrangement.

The prayer itself is composed, according to Papa, of four concentrically arranged units, each of which has two elements. The first and the last of the sections (A: vv. 24b-25a; A': vv. 29-30) are introduced by the similar terms Δέσποτα and κύριε and the content of the verses is parallel in that the first contains a prayer of praise and the last a prayer of supplication. The first stiche of A comes from Ps 146,6 (LXX) and the second forms an introduction to the major quotation which will appear in B. The second stiche ends with the phrase "David your servant" which parallels the last words of the last strophe ("Jesus your servant")⁽⁵⁾.

The second strophe (B: vv. 25b-26) contains a quotation of Ps 2,1-12 which is then shown to be fulfilled in B' (vv. 27-28). Again there are two

(1976) 212-214. R. PESCH (*Apostelgeschichte*, 178) recognized its distinctiveness in being the longest community prayer in the New Testament and describes it as having a "paradigmatischen Charakter". A. HAMMAN, "La nouvelle Pentecôte (Actes 4,24-30)", *BVC* 14 (1956) 82-90, recognizes the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as a parallel of the first Pentecost.

(3) It is not the intention of this article to enter into a discussion of possible sources behind 4,23-31. R. A. MARTIN, "Syntactical Evidence of Aramaic Sources in Acts 1-15", *NTS* 11 (1964) 38-59, however did find that 4,23-31 contained an unusual number of Semitisms.

(4) B. PAPA, *Atti degli Apostoli* (Vol. 1; Bologna 1981), 138-140. My attention was called to the possibility of a chiasmic arrangement in this passage by A. F. Danter, who also called my attention to Papa's treatment of it. Danter would see the passage, as does Papa, as a single chiasm.

Chiasmic structure is thought by a number of scholars to play a prominent role in Acts. Among those who, in addition to Papa, have been proponents of chiasm in Acts is Ch. TALBERT, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke - Acts* (Missoula 1974) and G. KRODEL, *Acts*.

On chiasm in the New Testament in general, see N. LUND, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill, NC 1941). Lund does not discuss the present passage.

The danger of finding chiasms where the author did not intend them is constant. We must be careful to be sure that the parallels consist of substantial elements of the material, that the parallels are clear, and that their existence contributes to the development of the thought and the theology of the section.

(5) PAPA, *Atti*, 138-139.

exactly parallel locations within the chiasm. The expected place for such a reference to David as servant would be at the end of v.26, following the reference to "his anointed" if it is to properly parallel the mention of Jesus as servant and anointed. I would propose (although it cannot be proved) that while the reference to the Lord's anointed in v.26 clearly refers to David, he himself is not mentioned there because the verse is a quotation of a Psalm. The reader is asked to recall the earlier explicit mention of David "your servant" and then to associate this with the explicit mention of "the Lord's anointed" and to parallel this with the mention of Jesus as his holy servant, whom he anointed.

Unit B, C, D and B', C', D':

The next three elements of the chiasm are closely related to one another as well as to their parallels and so are best treated together. Ps 2,1-2 makes up the next three elements of the first chiasm. "Why did the nations (ἔθνη) rage and the peoples (λαοὶ) devise vanities? The kings of the earth have stood up and rulers have gathered together against the Lord and his anointed (κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ)". There are five elements in this quotation (arranged for convenience in the diagram as three) which are paralleled in the text that follows, thus demonstrating that the text has been fulfilled in Jesus⁽¹¹⁾.

Then the second half of this unit (the fulfillment) begins in v.27. "In truth" (ἐπ' ἀληθείας), the apostles assert, "they have assembled in this city against your holy servant Jesus, whom you have anointed, Herod and Pontius Pilate with the nations and the people of Israel...". Here we are given a five point parallel from the life of Jesus to the Psalm passage already quoted: (1) the kings of the earth (Herod and Pontius Pilate) (2) and the nations (ἔθνεσιν) and the peoples (λαοὺς⁽¹²⁾) of Israel (4) have assembled against (συνήχθησαν... ἐπὶ) (5) your (holy servant Jesus whom you) anointed (ὃν ἔχρισας)⁽¹³⁾.

Thus the persecution of the Davidic king is seen as the prefiguring of the passion of Jesus, even down to the detail that each was "anointed". The lack of a true parallel between the references to Jesus and David as "servants" was discussed above. What does remain however is the clear parallelism between each as "anointed". This adds weight to the theory that the concentric arrangement is in fact intended by the author and that

appropriate rendition here. However it may also be that the distinction between παῖς and δοῦλος is intended to be linked to a distinction between David and Jesus on one hand and the apostles on the other.

⁽¹¹⁾ The parallels between the elements here are noted by PAPA (*Atti*, 139). He prefers to list them as two separate strophes which are parallel. I would suggest that a concentric arrangement details even more the way the second half is a fulfillment of the first.

⁽¹²⁾ On the curious plural here see G. KILPATRICK, "ΛΑΟΙ at Luke II.31 and Acts IV.25,27", *JThS* 16 (1965) 127; JOHNSON, *Acts*, 85.

⁽¹³⁾ These parallels are often noticed but without indicating an awareness of concentric arrangement. See for example, HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 227; JOHNSON, *Acts*, 84.

The First Section: 4,24b-28

The apostles begin by addressing God as Δέσποτα (v.24)⁽⁸⁾. This is the formal introduction to the first part of the prayer and will later be paralleled by the introduction to the second part of the passage which begins with the very similar address to God as κύριε (v. 29).

Unit A and A':

God is then described (v.24b) as "having made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all things within them" (a quote from Ps 146,6). This introduction which at first appears stylized and perfunctory is shown to be deliberate and essential to the argument when it is later paralleled by the quite similar reference to "all those things which your hand and your will have foreordained" (v.28). In the first God is described as Lord of creation; in the second he is described as Lord of history.

Next (v.25) God is said to have spoken through "the Holy Spirit through the mouth of our father and your servant David"⁽⁹⁾. This element as a whole does not have a parallel in the remaining material and was evidently seen simply as an introduction to the Psalm.

The mention of "servant" will be paralleled later (v.27) by the reference to Jesus also as "servant"⁽¹⁰⁾. These two elements do not occupy

⁽⁸⁾ It is commonly pointed out that the prayer here bears some similarity to the prayer of Isaiah 37,16-20. HAENCHEN (*Acts*, 226) observes this prayer begins with Δέσποτα rather than with Κύριε because that title could mistakenly be taken in a Christian sense if used here at the beginning. DUPONT ("Prière", 523) argues that it is used in tandem with δοῦλοι (v.29) as its correlative and points to the parallel usage in the prayer of Simeon in Luke 2,29 "Now you dismiss your servant, Master".

⁽⁹⁾ There are a number of textual variants here. These are occasioned by what the oldest manuscripts indicate as a peculiar arrangement of grammar and theology. A full discussion of the problems can be had in *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (ed. B. M. METZGER et al.; New York 1971) 321-323. This study agrees with the conclusions of the UBS committee: "Recognizing that the reading of π⁷⁴ & A B E *al* is unsatisfactory, the Committee nevertheless considered it to be closer to what the author wrote originally than any of the other extant forms of text" (*Commentary*, 323).

Other problems abound. The participle εἰπὼν is too far separated from the relative pronoun ὁ. The genitive "our father" is awkwardly placed after the relative and would seem intended to agree with "Holy Spirit" rather than with "David". We would also expect normally an additional διὰ before στόματος. In addition, the description of God speaking through the Holy Spirit is awkward. E. HAENCHEN ["Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte", *ZThK* 51 (1954) 156-157] is only one among the many who have attempted to reconstruct a plausible original. However it seems best to settle the problem on textual rather than on logical grounds. In spite of the remaining theological and grammatical awkwardness, the chiasmic arrangement proposed here confirms that the writer saw a parallelism between the action of God and that of David, as KRODEL (*Acts*, 113) says, "through the mediation of the Holy Spirit as his heavenly instrument and through the mouth of ... David his servant as his earthly instrument". I have proposed my own view of this peculiar phrase in "The Problems of Acts 4,25a: A New Proposal", *ZNW* 86 (1995).

⁽¹⁰⁾ Παῖς can be translated either "child" or "servant". Given the occurrence of δοῦλος later in the passage (v.29), it may be that "child/son" is the more

exactly parallel locations within the chiasm. The expected place for such a reference to David as servant would be at the end of v.26, following the reference to "his anointed" if it is to properly parallel the mention of Jesus as servant and anointed. I would propose (although it cannot be proved) that while the reference to the Lord's anointed in v.26 clearly refers to David, he himself is not mentioned there because the verse is a quotation of a Psalm. The reader is asked to recall the earlier explicit mention of David "your servant" and then to associate this with the explicit mention of "the Lord's anointed" and to parallel this with the mention of Jesus as his holy servant, whom he anointed.

Unit B, C, D and B', C', D':

The next three elements of the chiasm are closely related to one another as well as to their parallels and so are best treated together. Ps 2,1-2 makes up the next three elements of the first chiasm. "Why did the nations (ἔθνη) rage and the peoples (λαοὶ) devise vanities? The kings of the earth have stood up and rulers have gathered together against the Lord and his anointed (κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ)". There are five elements in this quotation (arranged for convenience in the diagram as three) which are paralleled in the text that follows, thus demonstrating that the text has been fulfilled in Jesus⁽¹¹⁾.

Then the second half of this unit (the fulfillment) begins in v. 27. "In truth" (ἐπ' ἀληθείας), the apostles assert, "they have assembled in this city against your holy servant Jesus, whom you have anointed, Herod and Pontius Pilate with the nations and the people of Israel...". Here we are given a five point parallel from the life of Jesus to the Psalm passage already quoted: (1) the kings of the earth (Herod and Pontius Pilate) (2) and the nations (ἔθνεσιν) and the peoples (λαοὶς⁽¹²⁾) of Israel (4) have assembled against (συνήχθησαν... ἐπὶ) (5) your (holy servant Jesus whom you) anointed (ὃν ἔχρισας)⁽¹³⁾.

Thus the persecution of the Davidic king is seen as the prefiguring of the passion of Jesus, even down to the detail that each was "anointed". The lack of a true parallel between the references to Jesus and David as "servants" was discussed above. What does remain however is the clear parallelism between each as "anointed". This adds weight to the theory that the concentric arrangement is in fact intended by the author and that

appropriate rendition here. However it may also be that the distinction between παῖς and δοῦλος is intended to be linked to a distinction between David and Jesus on one hand and the apostles on the other.

⁽¹¹⁾ The parallels between the elements here are noted by PAPA (*Atti*, 139). He prefers to list them as two separate strophes which are parallel. I would suggest that a concentric arrangement details even more the way the second half is a fulfillment of the first.

⁽¹²⁾ On the curious plural here see G. KILPATRICK, "ΛΑΟΙ at Luke II.31 and Acts IV.25,27", *JThS* 16 (1965) 127; JOHNSON, *Acts*, 85.

⁽¹³⁾ These parallels are often noticed but without indicating an awareness of concentric arrangement. See for example, HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 227; JOHNSON, *Acts*, 84.

the "adjustment" should be accounted for by an explanation similar to that above.

The actions of these rulers (as was seen above) is then viewed, not in human terms, but rather in terms of a divine context in which they are said to do nothing else but what the hand and the counsel of God foreordained. That is, the death of Jesus at the hands of Herod, Pontius Pilate, the nations, and Israel are part of the plan of God. He who, at the beginning of the section, was described as the God of creation is now shown also to be the God of history. Nothing happens without his allowance.

The overall parallelism in this first section can be summarized as follows:

Sovereign Lord,

A: You who made the heaven and earth and the sea and all things within them (you who spoke through the Holy Spirit, through the mouth of David, our father and your servant) said:

B: the nations rage; the peoples devise vanities

C: the kings and rulers

D: assembled against the Lord and his anointed

D': they assembled indeed in this city against your servant Jesus, whom you anointed

C': Herod and Pontius Pilate

B': with the nations and the peoples of Israel,

A': doing those things which your hand and your counsel foreordained.

The Purpose and Effect of the Arrangement

There seem to be two major theological points intended by this part of the passage. Turning first to the central elements of the section (B, C, D; D', C', B'), we see that the persecution of the Davidic king is a prefiguring of the persecution that Jesus was to suffer. Jesus's rejection by the Gentiles and by his people is a fulfillment of Scripture. The two elements stand in relation as prefigurement to fulfillment.

The first and last elements provide, in both a literary sense and a theological sense, the framework within which the persecution of Jesus (and of the Davidic king before him) is to be understood. The Lord God is both the creator and the ruler of all. Because of this whatever happens both to his servant David and to his servant Jesus is somehow part of his plan. In the light of arrest and detainment which Peter and John have just suffered, the text reminds the listeners that if such persecution happens, not only has it happened before but also it takes place only because God allows it.

The apostles give praise to God for his guiding providence and uses this to interpret the persecution which Peter and John have just undergone⁽¹⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁴⁾ PAPA (*Atti*, 139) correctly observes that there are elements of praise and of supplication in the section. However he sees only vv. 24a-25 as praise. I would argue that the whole section is one of praise and that the theme of supplication begins in v. 29 and continues to the end.

Thus this extensive concentric arrangement is not only clearly evident but the literary arrangement confirms and provides positive emphasis for the overall theological argument of the section.

The Second Section: 4,29-31

As was the case above, the second section is also introduced formally by an invocation of God, now addressed as κύριε. God is asked to look upon the threats made against Peter and John. Then in the body of the prayer, the apostles ask that God grant them the ability “with all boldness” (μετὰ παρρησίας πάσης) (2) “to speak your word” (λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον σου)⁽¹⁵⁾.

The prayer then continues by asking that this be accomplished “in the extending of your hand in healing and in the giving of wonders”⁽¹⁶⁾ (ἐν τῷ τὴν χειρὰ [σου] ἐκτείνειν σε εἰς ἱασιν καὶ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι)⁽¹⁷⁾. The central element of the prayer is that this be accomplished “through the name of your holy servant Jesus” (διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ).

In the second half of the section, we hear that while the apostles were still praying, the place where they were assembled was shaken. This of course is the literary parallel and the immediate fulfillment of their prayer that God give forth wonders in the name of Jesus.

The apostles are filled with the Holy Spirit and they are said (in a direct parallel to, and fulfillment of, their request at the beginning of the prayer) (1) to speak the word of God (καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) (2) with boldness (μετὰ παρρησίας).

⁽¹⁵⁾ HAENCHEN [*Acts*, 228] sees this as referring to missionary preaching rather than to the proclamation of the word within the community. JOHNSON [*Acts*, 85] sees the combination of speaking the word of God in connection with the reference to the power of the Holy Spirit to be a description of prophetic speaking and gives OT parallels. I would favor Haenchen's view on three grounds. First the mention of speaking parallels the necessity to speak that Peter had spoken of when arrested (v. 20). That was clearly missionary preaching. Second, this prayerful request for boldness in speaking in v. 29 makes reference back to the threats aimed at the apostles if they would speak openly again. Finally, in v. 31 we have the fulfillment of the apostles' request uttered in v. 20. This parallelism between the two is confirmed by their position within the chiasm.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Presumably the “signs and wonders” asked for are those said by Joel (cf. the quote of Joel 3,3 LXX in Acts 2,19) to be not only part of the circumstances surrounding the actual event of the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit but also part of the consequences as the signs and wonders are performed by the apostles (cf. 2,43).

⁽¹⁷⁾ The Nestle-Aland 27th edition and the UBS 4th edition now put in brackets the weakly attested σου which occurs immediately after χεῖρα in some manuscripts.

This arrangement can be diagrammed:

Lord, give to your servants:

B: with all boldness

C: to speak your word

D: in the extending of your hand in healing and in the giving of wonders

E: through the name of your hold servant Jesus.

D': The place where they were assembled was shaken and all were filled with the Holy Spirit,

C': and were speaking the word of God

B': with boldness.

The Purpose and Effect of the Arrangement

As in the first section, the arrangement contributes a considerable emphasis to the passage. What is asked for at the beginning is granted at the end: that they speak the word of the Lord with boldness. Furthermore the external manifestation of God's power which is asked for as a support is also granted. And in the center of the arrangement is the focus: that this is all to happen "in the name of your holy servant Jesus".

Not only is the reference to Jesus at the center of this section; it is at the center of the previous section also. And in both places Jesus is referred to in exactly the same terms:

(v. 27) ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν

(v. 30) διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ.

So the role of Jesus as the holy servant to God is emphasized not only by the verbal repetition but also by its placement at the center of each section. In each case the apostles' prayer is directed to God the Father but his holy servant Jesus is central to the working of his will.

Not only is the shaking of the place where they were gathered a fulfillment of their prayer for the manifestation of wonders, but implicit in the giving of the wonders and the tremor in the house is the manifestation of the same divine power and control that were described more directly in the first section. Also the reference to the healing in v. 30 ties the prayer to the prior healing of the beggar (3,1-10) and associates that with the present request for wonders.

Finally it should be noted that both sections are explicitly "Trinitarian" in that the Father is the one prayed to, the Holy Spirit is present as the vivifying force, and Jesus is present as the holy servant of God and the one in whose name (in spite of the threats and warnings by the authorities against it) they are to pray and to preach.

Conclusion

In retrospect, this, the prayer of the apostles in the wake of the first manifestation of persecution, presents a clearly ordered and theologically

significant response, confirming in the face of such persecution that God is always in control, that such happened to Jesus before them (as it had to David still earlier), and that God would grant them the power through the Holy Spirit and in the name of Jesus (accompanied at times by demonstrations of power) to speak the word in the face of such persecution. It is the combination of these elements: the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, the resulting *παρρησία*, the manifestation of signs and wonders, and the preaching of the word, which become a model for, and the backbone of, the spread of the message of Jesus throughout the remainder of Acts.

Loyola University of Chicago
Lake Shore Campus
6525 North Sheridan Road
Chicago, IL 60626
U.S.A.

U. C. VON WAHLDE

The Significance of the Seventh Plague

Regarding biblical lists that contain ten items G. A. Rendsburg writes: "in the Bible where rosters of ten occur, special prominence is given to the entries listed in the seventh and tenth positions"⁽¹⁾. Rendsburg's short note dealt primarily with Genesis 15 and the appearance of the Amorites in seventh position in a list of nations. He also drew attention to the findings of other scholars concerning the use of the positions seven and ten in Genesis 5 (specifically with respect to Enoch and Noah) and Ruth 4,18-22 (with regard to Boaz and David)⁽²⁾.

While these observations are undoubtedly correct, their foci have been primarily on lists of nations and genealogical rosters. However, as will be demonstrated below, the device also occurs in narrative, in particular in the most famous of all series of tens: the plagues of Egypt.

Studies and commentaries have dealt with the plagues of Exodus from a wide variety of angles and are so numerous so as not to require recapitulation here. Suffice it to say that the importance of the tenth plague, the death of Egypt's first born, long has been understood as the most devastating of the plagues. It is with the tenth plague, specifically with the death of Pharaoh's son, that the story reaches its climax. Pharaoh finally concedes and releases the people Israel.

While the sense of climax that accompanies the tenth plague escapes few readers, the importance of the seventh plague has gone unnoticed. Rather, the seventh plague typically is viewed simply as part of one dramatic build-up incorporating plagues one through nine⁽³⁾. It is here where an awareness of the convention noted above comes into play. In what follows, I will present the evidence in support of the notion that the seventh plague, like the tenth, was intended to stand out in the narrative, that is, above the other eight.

As observed already by Rashbam and Abrabanel, and more recently by U. Cassuto, M. Greenberg, and N. Sarna, the account of the plagues occurs in a tripartite literary structure⁽⁴⁾. According to Sarna: "The

(1) "Notes on Genesis XV", VT 42 (1992) 269.

(2) Ibid., 271, n. 20, 292, n. 21.

(3) For instance B.S. CHILDS, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia 1974) 160; N.M. SARNA, *Exploring Exodus: The Heritage of Biblical Israel* (New York 1986) 77; J.B. COFFMAN, *Commentary on Exodus: The Second Book of Moses* (Abilene, TX 1985) 119. To my knowledge, the only scholar to recognize the double climax was M. GREENBERG, *Understanding Exodus* (New York 1969) 172, n.1, though he did not offer an explanation thereof and he did not pursue the matter.

plagues are arranged in the form of three series of calamities comprising three afflictions in each series" (*Exodus*, 77). The first of each series begins with a time indication of warning (Exod 7,15; 8,16; 9,13), which happens to be in the morning, and with an instruction formula 'station yourself' employing the root *nšb*. As Greenberg notes⁽⁵⁾, the beginning of the third series, i.e., the seventh plague, contains an important variation on the formula. The first two series (first and fourth plagues) start: "Go to Pharaoh in the morning. Lo, he goes out to the water, and stand before him to confront him on the bank of the Nile" (Exod 7,15; compare 8,16). The seventh plague, however, omits "Lo, he goes out to the water" and "on the bank of the Nile"⁽⁶⁾. The author deviates from the expected order to suspend the reader's anticipation of the mention of water. It appears, of course, a few lines later in the form of hail⁽⁷⁾.

In addition to cues in the literary structure of the plague account, the importance of the seventh plague may be seen in that it is given the most verses of any plague except for the tenth⁽⁸⁾. Cassuto accounts for this by saying that since the seventh plague

is severer and more decisive than the earlier ones, the account of the plagues that it comprises is longer and fuller than that of the preceding plagues⁽⁹⁾.

(⁵) U. CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem 1967) 92-93; Greenberg, *Exodus*, 171; SARNA, *Exodus*, 76-77. See also Coffman, *Exodus*, 57; C. JOHNSON, *Wycliffe Bible Commentary: Old Testament* (Chicago 1962) 57; F. B. MEYER, *Exodus: Chapters I-XX* (Edinburgh 1952) 117. Both S. R. DRIVER, *The Book of Exodus* (Cambridge 1911) 72-76; and J. P. HYATT, *New Century Bible Commentary: Exodus* (Grand Rapids, MI. 1971) 117, attributed the structural differences to the hands of the assumed J, E, and P sources. D. MCCARTHY, "Moses' Dealings with Pharaoh: Ex 7,8-10,27", *CBQ* 27 (1965) 336-347 believed that the narrative is organized into two symmetrical groups of five. Some of these scholars, e.g., Cassuto, noted a secondary literary structure which operates simultaneously, namely, the pairing of the plagues into blood/frogs (both connected with the Nile), lice/flies (both insects), etc.

(⁶) M. GREENBERG, "The Thematic Unity of Exodus III-XI", *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* vol. 1 (Jerusalem 1967) 151-154; see also IDEM., *Exodus*, 188; and "The Redaction of the Plague Narrative in Exodus", *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. H. GOEDIKE; Baltimore 1971) 249. Greenberg, however, did not comment on the significance of the variation.

(⁷) Two other variations on the formula may be noted in passing. In 7,15 the niph'al form *niššabtā* "stand" is used. In 8,16 we get the hithpa'el *hityaššēb* "place yourself". In 7,15 the imperative of *lēk* "go" appears, but in 8,16 the hiph'il *haškēm* "rise up early" is used. It may also be argued that the expected water does not occur until 9,33, when rain first is mentioned as part of the storm. See already G. RAWLINSON, *Pulpit Commentary: Exodus* vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, MI. 1950) 220.

(⁸) IBN EZRA seems to have questioned the purpose of this omission in his comment to Exod 9,13: "It is not mentioned in this place that he [Pharaoh] went out to the water; perhaps there is another reason for this".

(⁹) The seventh is given 22 verses (Exod 9,13-35) and the tenth, 43 (Exod 11,1-12,33). This also was noted by CHILDS, *Exodus*, 158 and M. NOTH, *Exodus: A Commentary* (Philadelphia 1962) 80. Greenberg noted only the length of the third triplet, not the plague pericope alone; see SARNA, *Exodus*, 176.

(¹⁰) *Exodus*, 115. This formerly has been explained along the lines of COFFMAN, *Exodus*, 112: "Part of the reason (for its length) ... lies in the fact of God's taking pains to explain to Pharaoh why God had not already taken him off the face of the earth".

Similarly, the versions of the plagues given in Ps 68,42-51 and Ps 105,27-36 also devote more verses to the plague of hail than to any other. In addition to being given the most space, this scene also contains the longest uninterrupted divine monologue in the plague account: a total of seven (!) verses (Exod 9,13-19)¹⁰.

Further, it is with the seventh plague that we first are told that Pharaoh repents⁽¹¹⁾ of his deeds: "I have sinned this time. Yahweh is righteous⁽¹²⁾, and I and my people are wicked" (9,27), and that he promises to let the Israelites go⁽¹³⁾. As J. Hayes and J.M. Miller note, in other ancient Near Eastern accounts of plagues it is usually "the gods rather than the humans who repent and reform after a plague"⁽¹⁴⁾. Here, the god-king Pharaoh, who would have appeared to the Egyptian masses as responsible for the plagues, repents⁽¹⁵⁾. Thus Pharaoh's repentance marks a turning point in the story⁽¹⁶⁾ by coming at a time when the reader may be expecting a cessation or completion of events, i.e., in the number seven slot⁽¹⁷⁾.

Moreover, as A. Berlin observes⁽¹⁸⁾, after Moses intercedes to stop the plague at Pharaoh's request, Pharaoh sees the temporary cessation of events in reverse order. Immediately after the narrator states that "the thunder and hail ceased, and rain did not pour down on the land" (9,33), Pharaoh observes that "the rain and the hail and the thunder had ceased" and so "he continued sinning" (9,34)⁽¹⁹⁾. Elsewhere, either the phenomena are reported to Pharaoh in the order in which they occur, or Pharaoh's observations are not recorded, e.g. 8,27; 9,7; 10,19; 12,29.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Compare: plague one — 5 (7,14-18); plague two — 4 (7,26-29); plague three — 1 (8,12); plague four — 4 (8,16-19); plague five — 4 (9,1-4); plague six — 2 (9,8-9); plague eight — 1 (10,12); plague nine — 1 (10,21); plague ten — 2 (11,1-2).

⁽¹¹⁾ For the view that Pharaoh is not penitent see A.H. McNEILE, *The Book of Exodus* (London 1908) 56; Driver, *Exodus* 75. That he does appear penitent see M. POOLE, *A Commentary on the Holy Bible*, vol. 1: *Genesis-Job* (McLean, Virginia 1980) 134.

⁽¹²⁾ Moreover, as Ibn Ezra noted, the divine name appears in the mouth of Pharaoh only here; cf. Exod 9,28.

⁽¹³⁾ He does so again in 10,17.

⁽¹⁴⁾ J. HAYES and J.M. MILLER, *Israelite and Judaeon History* (Philadelphia 1977) 200.

⁽¹⁵⁾ HAYES and MILLER (*Ibid.*, 200), in my opinion, totally missed the point when they added: "This is certainly not the case with the plagues of Exodus 7-11". They questioned why, contrary to other ancient Near Eastern plague accounts, Yahweh does not repent. It is not the God Yahweh who is expected to repent here, but the god-king Pharaoh.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Indeed, as Ibn Ezra rightly noted, the reader is to connect the use of *pa'am* "time" in Exod 9,35 with its use earlier in Exod 9,14 where we read: "This time I will send all my plagues upon your heart..."

⁽¹⁷⁾ Similar to the seven days of creation (Gen 1,1-2,3).

⁽¹⁸⁾ A. BERLIN, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield 1983) 73.

⁽¹⁹⁾ BERLIN (*Ibid.*, 73), sees this as "a hint that Pharaoh has not yet got things straight: he does not see things the same way as Moses and the narrator do". Also W.J. MARTIN, "'Dischronologized' Narrative in the Old Testament", *Congress Volume Rome 1968* (SVT 17; Leiden 1969) 179-186.

In addition to literary markers, there are clues in the language which bespeak the heightened relevance of the seventh plague. Before the arrival of the hail and thunderstorms Moses repeats Yahweh's threat: "For I will at this time send *all* my plagues upon your heart and upon your servants, and upon your people, that you may know that there is none like me in *all* the earth" (Exod 9,14). According to Berlin the word "all" is a quantifier often used "to highlight an important event or theme in the narrative" ⁽²⁰⁾. As only four plagues remain (including the seventh), the word "all" can serve no other purpose ⁽²¹⁾. Cassuto (*Exodus*, 119) also notes a hyperbolic use of the word "all" in 9,25, where we are told that the hail devastated "*everything* that was in the field, *every* herb of the field, and *every* tree that was in the field". Moreover, as T. Fretheim remarks:

In terms of rhetoric, repetition is noteworthy, for example, the word *kōl*, "all", is pervasive, used over fifty times; it may provide an interpretive clue to the narrative. While in every plague, there is an explosion in its use...as one moves into the seventh plague. This is an extravagance of language, perhaps even a failure of language, in an effort to speak of the increasing intensity in the final plagues... ⁽²²⁾.

The same verse contains a significant variation on Yahweh's threats. Instead of stating, as is done for all previous plagues, "Yahweh will send upon *you* (i.e., upon the Pharaoh and upon Egypt)" the particular plague, Yahweh thunders, "I will... send all my plagues upon *your heart*". After each of the previous plagues, we are told that the Pharaoh "hardened his heart" (Exod 7,22; 8,15; 9,12.35) ⁽²³⁾. That Yahweh now aims the plague at Pharaoh's heart signals the importance and directness of the attack ⁽²⁴⁾. This connection is cemented further by the nexus between Pharaoh's hardened (*kābēd*) heart and the hail which was "heavy" (*kābēd*) (Exod 7,14; 8,11.28; 9,7.18.24.34; 10,1) ⁽²⁵⁾. In addition, unlike the hardening of Pharaoh's heart after other plagues, with the seventh, Yahweh hardens not only the heart of Pharaoh, but also the hearts of his servants (9,34) ⁽²⁶⁾.

⁽²⁰⁾ *Poetics*, 105. See also COFFMAN, *Exodus*, 92, 112.

⁽²¹⁾ DRIVER (*Exodus*, 72) struggled with the "inconsistent" expression, suggesting the need for emendation. It is interesting to note that Rashi saw the phrase "all my plagues" as harkening to the most climactic of the plagues, the tenth: "We learn from here that the plague of the firstborn is balanced (of equal importance) against all other plagues (together)".

⁽²²⁾ T. E. FRETHEIM, "The Plagues as Ecological Signs of Historical Disaster", *JBL* 110 (1991) 386.

⁽²³⁾ The formula also appears after the following four plagues: 10,20.27; 14,4.8. For the meaning of a "hardened heart" and its frequent use in the plagues account see SARNA, *Exodus*, 64; R. WILSON, "The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart", *CBQ* 41 (1979) 18-36; and H. RÄISÄNEN, *The Idea of Divine Hardening* (Helsinki 1972).

⁽²⁴⁾ This also was noticed by COFFMAN, *Exodus*, 112 and by POOLE, *A Commentary*, 133. Note the remark of McNEILE, *Exodus*, 54, that "the text may be corrupt".

⁽²⁵⁾ As noted by CASSUTO, *Exodus*, 122.

⁽²⁶⁾ Ibn Ezra noted the same, cf. Exod 9,30. It is also interesting to note that Cassuto (*Exodus*, 115) took this line as a reference to the tenth plague.

Furthermore, after each of the previous plagues we are told that despite the miraculous efforts of Moses, God hardened Pharaoh's heart. After six such hardenings on the part of God the reader quite naturally is forced to ask why. It is only here, immediately before the seventh, where an explanation is given: "Nevertheless, I have spared you for this purpose: in order to show you My power, and in order that My Name may resound throughout the world" (Exod 9,16)⁽²⁷⁾.

In 9,14 the pericope also contains a significant variation on the repeated admonition, "that you may know that there is none like Yahweh our God". In Greenberg's words it

is not out of place in the first triplet, and yet it is not as thematically significant as the analogous clause in 9:14. For the latter occurs in God's message at the head of a triplet, and is reiterated four times in the following narrative. This is not the case of the clause of 8:6, nor, again, of that of 9:29 (*Exodus*, 175, n. 1).

The placement of the warning immediately before the seventh plague is meant to heighten the expectation of relief, a relief befitting the number seven slot. The seventh plague also stands out by its peculiarly descriptive range of devastation. Greenberg remarks:

... the first triplet establishes God as a power beyond and other than the magic of Egypt, the second shows his presence in the land through a discriminating application of punishment, and the third gives scope to his power, more than anything that history has to tell (*Ibid.*, 175).

As G. Hort notes⁽²⁸⁾, unlike the others which are said to have struck either "upon all of Egypt" or "not upon the land of Goshen", the seventh is given a three-fold description of its range; i.e., "upon all of Egypt", "not upon the land of Goshen", and upon those in Egypt who did not regard the word of Yahweh (9,20-21.22.26).

Moreover, as the narrator tells us in 9,31, the seventh plague had most devastating repercussions: "the flax and the barley were smitten: for the barley was in the ear, and the flax was balled". This affected the production and export of Egypt's linen goods, for which it was famous, and upon which its economy depended⁽²⁹⁾. That the upper levels of Egyptian society, and especially the priestly class seldom wore any other kind of clothing⁽³⁰⁾ also suggests that the plague represented a direct attack upon the political and religious establishment. As C. Aling, among others, observes, the seventh plague

⁽²⁷⁾ It perhaps is also no coincidence that after the seventh plague the verb כָּבַד "harden" no longer occurs in reference to the "hardening" of Pharaoh's heart; cf. Exod 7,14.22; 8,11.15; 9,7.12.34.35; 10,1.20.27; 11,9; 13,15; 14,4.5.8.17.

⁽²⁸⁾ G. HORT, "The Plagues of Egypt", *ZAW* 69 (1957) 86.

⁽²⁹⁾ Prov 7,16, Ezek 27,7. See A. LUCAS, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries* (4th ed., London 1962) 143; C.F. ALING, *Egypt and the Bible from Earliest Times to 1000 B.C.* (Grand Rapids, MI 1981) 107; COFFMAN, *Exodus*, 117.

⁽³⁰⁾ HERODOTUS, 2.37.

may also be seen as an attack on the gods of Egypt who were considered responsible for that productivity, primarily Re and other solar dieties, and Osiris, a god of the dead who was intimately connected with grain⁽³¹⁾.

Support for the importance of the seventh plague also comes from the fact that in a land where the threat of most of the mentioned plagues is always a possibility, the seventh plague would have appeared miraculous even to the Egyptians. As R. Stieglitz remarks:

In the case of the ten plagues in Exodus, the Bible portrays the pharaoh and his magicians and physicians confronted first by some plagues that were known previously — blood and frogs. Other plagues, however — hail and darkness — were unprecedented, and thus defied Egyptian understanding and experience⁽³²⁾.

Even if a periodic hail or thundershower could occur in Egypt⁽³³⁾, as some suggest⁽³⁴⁾, the seventh plague is twice recorded as greater than any other storm that had struck Egypt from its foundation to the present (9,18,24)⁽³⁵⁾.

The plague of hail is visibly important also in 9,23-26. Three points stand out in this section which suggest that the seventh plague held special importance. The first is the frequency with which we hear the word hail. In the entire pericope, the word hail occurs a total of fourteen times! No other plague is mentioned as often. Moreover, the word “hail” resounds later in the account of the next plague, locusts, where it appears three times in connection with the crops available to the insects (10,5,12,15).

We may take this a step further. Cassuto observes a deliberate and frequent use of the number seven in the plagues account. After the Nile becomes blood the narrator informs us: “And seven days were fulfilled after Yahweh had struck the Nile (7,25)”. To Cassuto the number seven “serves to emphasize the principal word in the paragraph, namely the Nile,

⁽³¹⁾ *Egypt and the Bible*, 107. That the plagues represent judgments against the Egyptian gods is brought out further in Exod 12,12: “I will meet out punishments against all the gods of Egypt, I Yahweh”. See also Num 33,4; Jer 46,25; Wisdom of Solomon 12,23-27; 16,1-14. As noted by SARNA, *Exodus*, 78. See also COFFMAN, *Exodus*, 115-116. For specific gods hypothesized see W. FIELDS, *Exploring Exodus* (Joplin, Missouri 1976) 211. References to the Egyptian gods need not be explicit. See G. A. RENDSBURG, “Targum Onqelos to Exod. 10:5, 10:15, Numb. 22:5, 22:11”, *Henoch* 12 (1990) 15-17.

⁽³²⁾ R. STIEGLITZ, “Ancient Records and the Exodus Plagues”, *BAR* 13/6 (1987) 49.

⁽³³⁾ Such as the abnormal flooding which struck Egypt in late 1994. See, e.g., “200 Egyptians Die When Blazing Fuel Floods Their Homes”, *New York Times*, November 3, 1994 A, 1:1.

⁽³⁴⁾ G. HORT noted that the phenomenon is extremely infrequent. “The Plagues of Egypt (Part Two)”, *ZAW* 70 (1958) 48. See also SARNA, *Exodus*, 78; POOLE, *A Commentary*, 134.

⁽³⁵⁾ A. COLE, *Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL 1973) 98, noted that the magnitude of the storm is the issue deemed to be the most important aspect of the passage.

which occurs fourteen times in the course of the paragraph — twice times seven” (*Exodus*, 100). The use of the number seven is extensive. The swarm of flies occurs in its pericope seven times⁽³⁶⁾. In the account of the seventh plague, the word “land” (*‘ereṣ*) appears seven times, the seventh of which occurs alongside Goshen⁽³⁷⁾. In the same paragraph, “field” (*śādeh*) appears seven times, and as mentioned above, “hail” (*bārād*) occurs fourteen times, twice times seven⁽³⁸⁾. According to Cassuto, the plagues account utilizes “a numerical schematism that finds expression in the mention of the name of a plague seven times (flies, locusts), or fourteen times (hail)” (*Exodus*, 135). He adds:

The tendency towards numerical patterns based on the number seven and on the sexigesimal system is observable throughout the section. In the first cycle, the names of the plagues occur 21 times — three times seven (blood 5 times, frogs 11, gnats 5) and with the paragraph pertaining to the crocodile (3 times), 24 — twice times twelve; in the second cycle 12 times (swarms of flies 7, pest 1, boils 4); in the third cycle 24 (hail 14, locusts 7, darkness 3); in all 60 times. All this can hardly be fortuitous (*Ibid.*, 135).

The importance of the seventh plague, therefore, is in keeping with the symbolic use of the number seven within the narrative⁽³⁹⁾.

The third point which stands out in 9,23-26 is that in the ancient Near East, and especially in Egypt, fire and water (hail), were manifestations of the divine presence⁽⁴⁰⁾. Not only were there a number of “fiery” deities in Egypt, but the appearance of a god before a priest was accompanied by fire⁽⁴¹⁾. The Egyptians’ reverence for water and its valuable properties perhaps was due to their dependence on the annual inundation of the Nile which influenced many aspects of their lives, e.g., their calendar, property value, food supply, etc.⁽⁴²⁾. The significance of the two elements in Egyptian daily and religious life, therefore, suggests that there is a great fitness and propriety in the Egyptians being punished by fire and water⁽⁴³⁾.

To the Israelites, fire and water represented Yahweh’s wrath and judgement⁽⁴⁴⁾. Thunder and lightnings were present as signs of Yahweh’s

⁽³⁶⁾ CASSUTO, *Exodus*, 110.

⁽³⁷⁾ *Ibid.*, 120.

⁽³⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁽³⁹⁾ See also G. R. DRIVER, “Sacred Numbers and Round Figures”, *Promise and Fulfillment: Essays Presented to S.H. Hooke in Celebration of his Ninetieth Birthday* (ed. F. F. BRUCE; Edinburgh 1963) 62-90.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ E. HORNUNG, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many* (Ithaca, NY 1982) 197. Babylonian literature also speaks of water and fire as elements in the creative process; see, e.g., *Enuma Elish* I:4-5, 96, 160 (concerning the creation of the world) II:50, 109; and *Gilgamesh* XI: 100-104 (concerning Marduk).

⁽⁴¹⁾ HORNUNG, *Ibid.*, 80, 197.

⁽⁴²⁾ B. WATTERSON, *The Gods of Ancient Egypt* (New York 1984) 29-30.

⁽⁴³⁾ The writer’s apparent familiarity with Egyptian religion may imply that the text was redacted at a time when Israel had much contact with Egypt, e.g., during the Solomonic period. However, this is beyond the scope of this study.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ See M. ASTOUR, *Hellenosemitica: An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece* (Leiden 1967) 212.

presence on Sinai (Exod 19,16). Elsewhere in the Bible, hail figures in theophanies and as signs of Yahweh's judgment (Josh 10,11; [with fire] Ps 18,13; 148,8; 2 Sam 22,8-16⁽⁴⁵⁾; Job 38,22; Hag 2,17; Isa 28,2.17; 30,30). Moreover, not only were fire and water present at the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, but as the later sages note, the creation of the world and the great deluge involved torrents mixed with fire⁽⁴⁶⁾. Water and fire, therefore, are theologically important symbols in the narrative.

Finally, the Rabbis who were responsible for the annual reading cycle of the Torah also seem to have recognized the importance of the seventh plague. Note that *פרשת וארא* ends at Exod 9,35 and that *פרשת בא* begins at Exod 11,1, i.e., the reading cycle places a division between the first seven plagues and the remaining three⁽⁴⁷⁾.

The cumulative evidence demonstrates that the plague of hail and thunderstorms, like the death of the first born, was understood as possessing special significance⁽⁴⁸⁾. As with other lists of ten, the importance of the plague was cued by placing it in the seventh position⁽⁴⁹⁾. This conclusion illustrates that the convention here discussed was not limited to genealogical lists and rosters of nations, but also was incorporated into the structure of the biblical narrative. Such an interpretation demonstrates once more how a holistic approach bears out the unity of the narrative⁽⁵⁰⁾. Regardless of what sources may underlie the account in the book of Exodus⁽⁵¹⁾, the finished product reflects an essential coherence with the inclusion of a deliberate rhetorical device, namely, the double climax, organized in accordance with the seven/ten literary convention⁽⁵²⁾.

Department of Near Eastern Studies
360 Rockefeller Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
U.S.A.

Scott B. NOEGEL

⁽⁴⁵⁾ For the Samuel passage as an allusion to the seventh plague, see M. GARSIEL, *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies, and Parallels* (Ramat-Gan 1985) 49-50.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ See, e.g., *b.Zev* 113b; *b.Sanh* 108b; *b.RHSh* 129; *y.Sanh* 10, 29b.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ For a similar understanding of such text divisions, see G. A. RENDSBURG, *The Redaction of Genesis* (Winona Lake, IN 1986) 25.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Note that seven and ten also appear in magical formulae found in the Cairo Genizah. See, e.g., L. H. SCHIFFMAN, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah: Selected Texts from Taylor-Schechter Box K1* (Sheffield 1992) 163.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ The author of the book of Revelation also appears to have recognized the device. Observe how the plague of *χάλαζα* "hail" appears in connection with the seventh seal (Rev 8,7) and the seventh angel (Rev 16,21).

⁽⁵⁰⁾ See similarly RENDSBURG, *The Redaction of Genesis*.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Since none of the assumed sources (J, E, P) contains all ten of the plagues one might question whether a final redactor accented the seventh. Given that we do not possess any independent witnesses to these sources, I opt to examine the text as it appears before us now and not as based on hypothetical reconstructions.

⁽⁵²⁾ For other numerical patterns in the plagues narrative, see A. M. CARTUN, "'Who Knows Ten?' The Structural and Symbolic Use of Numbers in the Ten Plagues: Exodus 7:14-13:16", *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 45 (1991) 65-119.

‘Are We His People Or Not?’ Biblical Interpretation During Crisis(*)

The Psalter reflects the heart and soul of ancient Israel; it records her triumphs and trials, her praise and complaints. The psalms, however, were more than a way to praise and plead with God. They were a way of remembering the promises of the past, and, as such, they engaged history. Sometimes the very promises of God remembered in the psalms became the focus of Israel's complaint to her God. In the case of Psalm 100, the crisis of the Babylonian exile was a catalyst for further theological reflection and discourse. Psalm 100 was centered in the liturgical tradition in the pre-exilic period; and later, its central verse, "Know that Yahweh, he is God; he created us and ... we are his people and the sheep of his pasture", became a focus of discourse in the exilic period. This paper focuses particularly on interplay between Psalm 100 and Psalm 79, Psalm 95, and Ezekiel 34.

I. Inner-biblical Discourse⁽¹⁾

The seminal work by Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*⁽²⁾, has, among other things, drawn our attention to a vast network of literary interplay within the Hebrew Bible. For this it has garnered almost unanimous kudos. Fishbane's work, however, has not been without its critics. James Kugel, for example, takes Fishbane to task for relying too heavily on rabbinic models of exegesis⁽³⁾. More recently, Lyle Eslinger has rightly pointed out that the term "inner-biblical exegesis" too narrowly describes the interplay of biblical texts⁽⁴⁾. Eslinger suggests the term "inner-biblical allusion". Allusion, however, seems far too weak and encompassing a term to be used meaningfully.

Eslinger's attempt to jettison the term "exegesis" stems from his largely ahistorical interests. For those whose interest is merely in the "literariness" of biblical texts, the term "allusion" will suffice. Certainly, it is easy to criticize the historical critical judgments which an exegetical

(*) A shorter version of this paper was read at the Society of Biblical Literature in November 1993.

(1) The term "inner-biblical discourse" is used in a slightly different way by M. FISHBANE in his essay, "The Book of Job and Inner Biblical Discourse", in L. G. PERDUE and W. C. GILPIN (eds.), *The Voice from the Whirlwind: Interpreting the Book of Job* (Nashville 1992) 86-98.

(2) M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985).

(3) J. KUGEL, "The Bible's Earliest Interpreters", *Prooftexts* 7 (1987) 275-276.

(4) L. ESLINGER, "Inner-biblical Exegesis and Inner-biblical Allusion: The Question of Category", *VT* 42 (1992) 47-58.

model necessarily makes⁽⁵⁾. However, there is a broad consensus that biblical literature was produced over the course of a long period of time — at least 500 if not 1000 years. The production of biblical texts over time has historical critical implications, even if Eslinger wants to ignore these diachronic implications in his analysis of literary allusion. Historical critical judgments do have to be made in order to discuss diachronic interpretations, but it is hardly credible to dismiss Fishbane's work with the cavalier argument, "You cannot discuss the qualities of diachronic interpretation in the detailed way the Fishbane does if you are not sure which way the literary connection points"⁽⁶⁾. To be sure the historical critical judgments that Fishbane makes are just that — judgments — but they are not baseless judgments.

The question of terminology does highlight one of the weaknesses in Fishbane's masterful study, namely its reliance on a textual model. To be sure, this model is necessitated to a great extent by the nature of the evidence — that is, textual. And, certainly later Jewish interpretation is primarily textual. In this respect, James Kugel's criticism of Fishbane, namely that he relies too heavily on a rabbinic model, has some justification⁽⁷⁾. Nowhere is the inadequacy of a textual model more clear than in the book of Psalms. Although the Psalter has come to us as text, much of the Psalter was known in ancient Israel and early Judaism as liturgy. And, although our knowledge of the book of Psalms is necessarily dependent on its present textual form, our analysis of the interplay within the Psalms and between the Psalms and other literature must recognize the oral nature of this literature. In this case then, the term inner-biblical exegesis is inadequate because it implies a purely textual relationship. On the other hand, the term inner-biblical allusion minimizes and ignores the historical substance of the dialogue between texts. For these reasons, the term "inner-biblical discourse" seems especially apt. It acknowledges that the relationship between textual artifacts may not be purely textual. It also underscores — unlike the term "allusion" — that there is historical substance behind the interplay between preserved traditions.

The setting and dating of these texts is thus pivotal to understanding the theological discourse between them. Psalm 100 is generally recognized as a pre-exilic thanksgiving hymn⁽⁸⁾. Although it is difficult to precisely date psalms, there is nothing which would suggest a later date for this psalm. The most objective criterion for dating Psalms is language⁽⁹⁾; on this criterion we may note that Ps 100,5 uses the Classical Biblical Hebrew

⁽⁵⁾ Eslinger's characterisation of the work of historical criticism in general and Fishbane in particular as literary naïveté is an unfair, but not untypical smear. M. FISHBANE in particular is hardly naïve in issues of literature; see, for example, *Text and Texture* (New York 1979) and *The Garments of the Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics* (Bloomington 1988).

⁽⁶⁾ ESLINGER, "Inner-biblical Exegesis and Inner-biblical Allusion", 49.

⁽⁷⁾ KUGEL, "The Bible's Earliest Interpreters", 275-276.

⁽⁸⁾ See, for example, A. WEISER, *The Psalms, a Commentary* (Philadelphia 1962) 52-66, 645-647.

⁽⁹⁾ See A. HURVITZ, *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem 1972) [Hebrew].

expression עַד־דֹּר וְדֹר whereas Ps 79,13 uses the Late Biblical Hebrew expression לְדֹר וְדֹר (both expressions may be translated, “for all generations”). On the basis of language alone then we should reject the older view which placed Psalm 100 in the Greek Period⁽¹⁰⁾. This is an indication that the Psalm 100 is pre-exilic and that Psalm 79 is later. Aside from language, the content of Psalm 79, Psalm 95 and Ezekiel 34 deals specifically with the theological questions which arose from the Babylonian exile. Each of their interpretive trajectories proceed first of all from the ambiguities in Psalm 100. Ultimately however, they are the responses of a people in the dark night of the Babylonian exile trying to understand in what sense God was still God and Israel was still his chosen people. Through inner-biblical discourse with Psalm 100 an exiled people struggled to understand their catastrophe and rebuild their identity.

II. Psalm 100: “We are Indeed His People”

Traditional translations gloss over the textual and interpretative problems in Psalm 100 that became the springboard for exilic and post-exilic reflection. The interpretative problems in Psalm 100 begin with textual matters which can be partially solved by historical grammar. There has been a long-standing crux in the text of verse 3. The MT reads,

דַּעוּ כִּי־יְהוָה הוּא אֱלֹהִים הוּא־עָשָׂנוּ וְלֹא [Q לוֹ] אֲנַחְנוּ עַמּוֹ וּצְאָן מִרְעִיתוֹ.

The verse begins, “Know that Yahweh is God; he created us”. The second part of the verse is particularly problematic and has generated a wide variety of interpretations. The Massoretes write the text with the negative particle *lamed-aleph* (pronounced, *lōʾ*); the *Qere*, however, suggests reading the text as the prepositional form, *lamed-waw* (pronounced similarly, *lō*). The *Qere-Ketib* here underlines the oral nature of this text, that is, the liturgical setting. The oral and liturgical setting of this psalm would have invited the interchange of these (and other) homophonic words and the resulting ambiguity.

The reason for the *Qere* is obvious: as written, any understanding of the text seems either unacceptable or forced. Reading with the *Ketib*, the first possibility might be, “Know that Yahweh is God; he created us, but we are *not* his people”. Although the syntax might permit such a translation, the context makes it unacceptable; this verse should be a triumphant assertion that Israel is Yahweh’s people. The Septuagint provides a second alternative for reading with the *Ketib*, αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ οὐκ ἡμεῖς “He created us and not we ourselves”. This reading is awkward because it leaves the final clause (“his people and the sheep of his pasture”) dangling. To the text’s rescue comes the Masoretic reading tradition, which apparently provides a solution by substituting the prepositional form for the negative particle. The Targumim and the Medieval Jewish commentators follow the *Qere*. Recent commentaries and translations have also followed the traditional Jewish interpretation; for

⁽¹⁰⁾ E.g., C. BRIGGS, *The Book of Psalms*, I (Edinburgh 1906) LXXX.

example, the NRSV reads, “Know that the LORD is God. It is he that made us, and we are his; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture”⁽¹¹⁾. Yet, this reading also leaves the final clause dangling. The NRSV solves this problem by supplying “we are” in their translation⁽¹²⁾.

The textual difficulty in Ps 100,3 results from an emphatic (or asseverative) *lamed* whose meaning was obscured in the history of the psalm⁽¹³⁾. This emphatic *lamed* was unrecognized by later scribes and translators. This would give us the reading,

Know that Yahweh is God; he has created us.

« וְלֹא אֲנַחְנוּ » (14) עָמוּ וְצֹאן מִרְעִיתוֹ

We are indeed his people and the sheep of his pasture.

The remarkable parallel between Psalm 79 and Psalm 100 supports the priority of this reading⁽¹⁵⁾. In Ps 79,13 the psalmist addresses God in words strikingly similar to Psalm 100 — only without the problematic reading of the *Qere/Ketib*; וְאֲנַחְנוּ עָמוּךְ וְצֹאן מִרְעִיתֶךָ: “We are your people and the sheep of your pasture”. Another more general parallel from Psalm 95 adds further support for this reading: וְאֲנַחְנוּ עַם מִרְעִיתוֹ וְצֹאן יָדוֹ: “we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand” (95,7)⁽¹⁶⁾. Although it is unlikely that the Peshitta is a superior text, it nevertheless further underscores the proper reading of Ps 100,3 as an emphatic declaration: “We are indeed his people and the sheep of his pasture!”. In fact, all three of these passages are emphatic statements of God’s relationship to his people, and in such a

(11) E.g., H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1960) 686 [ET; *Psalms 60--150* (Minneapolis 1989) 273]; BRIGGS, *Psalms*, II, 310. The Massoretic tradition follows the Targum and many Hebrew manuscripts.

(12) The *Ketib* might be understood by reading לֹא as an unmarked rhetorical question, “Know that YHWH, he is God; he created us! Are we *not* his people and the sheep of his pasture?” (see GKC §150a; H. G. MITCHELL, “The omission of the interrogative particle”, in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in memory of W. R. Harper* [Chicago, 1907] 113-118). Yet, many of these so-called unmarked rhetorical questions should probably be understood as asseveratives and related to the emphatic *lamed*.

(13) Ugaritic poetry as well as texts elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible provide ample evidence for the existence of an emphatic *lamed* in ancient Hebrew. For a discussion, examples, and literature, see W. SCHNIEDEWIND and D. SIVAN, “Letting Your ‘Yes’ be ‘No’ in Ancient Israel: A Study of the Asseverative לֹא and הֲלֹא in Hebrew”, *JSS* 38 (1993) 209-226.

(14) This reading preserves the text of the MT; it is also possible to read the text with a prefixed emphatic *lamed* (e.g., וְלֹאֲנַחְנוּ) which is more typical of Ugaritic and the current MT can be explained by the dittography of the *aleph*.

(15) This reading was first proposed in a short note by J. LEWIS, “An Asseverative לֹא in Psalm 100,3?” *JBL* 86 (1967) 216. Lewis suggests that this לֹא comes from an asseverative *lamed* which was “misunderstood or forgotten by those who pointed the text”. Kraus mentions it, but apparently rejects it (*Psalms 60-150*, 270); M. TATE argues for Lewis’ reading (*Psalms 51-100* [Word Biblical Commentary; Dallas 1990] 533-534). None of the commentators seem aware of the import of the parallel between Psalm 79 and 100 for this problem.

(16) The Syriac version of Ps 95,7 actually provides a nearly exact parallel to Ps 100,3. Although this textual tradition should probably be understood as being influenced by Ps 100,3, it nevertheless highlights the natural interplay of these texts.

statement the emphatic *lamed* is particularly appropriate. These parallels solve the textual problem in Psalm 100. They also serve to open up a world of inner-biblical discourse in Psalms 79 and 95 and in Ezekiel 34. It is not only the "original" reading of Psalm 100 which interests us, but also the resulting discourse. In this respect, the flexibility that the oral liturgical tradition allows and even fosters the resulting discourse.

With the textual problems in their proper place, we can now turn to the interpretive ambiguities in Ps 100,3. In Psalm 100, five short but carefully reasoned verses proclaim that Yahweh should be worshipped because he is a true, merciful, and faithful God.

- A1 ¹ Make a joyful noise to Yahweh, all the earth.
- A2 ² Worship Yahweh with gladness;
- A3 Come into his presence with singing.
- B1 ³ Know that Yahweh is God! It is he that made us;
- B2 We are indeed his people, and the sheep of his pasture.
- C1 ⁴ Enter his gates with thanksgiving, and his courts with praise.
- C2 Give thanks to him, bless his name.
- D1 ⁵ For Yahweh is good;
- D2 his steadfast love endures forever,
- D3 and his faithfulness to all generations.

The psalm alternates between commands to worship (stanzas A, C) Yahweh and explanations of why Yahweh deserves Israel's praise (stanzas B, D)⁽¹⁷⁾. First in vv. 1-2 (stanza A), we have the imperative to worship Yahweh: "Shout", "Serve Yahweh", "Come before him!" These commands naturally lead into an explanation of why Yahweh is worthy of Israel's praise in v. 3 (stanza B). Yahweh should be worshipped because he is the true God who created Israel. Moreover, Israel is his people. In v. 4 (stanza C) the psalmist returns again to the imperative mood, enjoining Israel to "enter his gates with thanksgiving and his courts with praise" and to "Give thanks to Yahweh". Finally, in v. 5 (stanza D) the psalm again explains why Yahweh is worthy of this praise: "Yahweh is good, merciful, and faithful".

The fulcrum of the psalm is verse 3. The first half of the verse begins, "Know that Yahweh is God!" The verb "to know" (יָדַע) is not an abstract recognition of Yahweh's supremacy, but the practical acknowledgment of Yahweh demonstrated by observing of the covenant⁽¹⁸⁾. We have already established that the second half of the verse should be read as an asseverative, but the mood of the verse is still ambiguous. What is the relationship between the two parts? Is this verse an assertion or a command? In other words, does Yahweh promise that Israel is his people or

⁽¹⁷⁾ See W. BRUEGGEMANN, "Psalm 100", *Int* 39 (1985) 65-74.

⁽¹⁸⁾ See H. HUFFMAN, "The Treaty Background of Hebrew *yāda'*", *BASOR* 184 (1966) 36-38.

does Yahweh demand that Israel acknowledge that He is God? Does the Israel's status as God's people flow naturally from the fact that Yahweh is God or does it depend upon their recognition of Yahweh? The different approaches to this question are played out dramatically in Psalms 79 and 95.

III. Psalm 79, A Challenge to God

Psalm 79 is an exilic psalm of lament. The psalmist asks, what about my generation which sits in exile? And, it challenges Yahweh to prove that his mercy endures forever. Finally, in the last verse the psalmist declares, “we are your people and the sheep of your pasture” (v. 13).

The psalm can be divided into four parts following the typical pattern of lament psalms. In verses 1-4, the psalmist describes the plight of Israel. The nations have invaded Israel, defiled the temple, and left Jerusalem in ruins. Yahweh's people have been slaughtered, and now they are reproached by the nations. This description firmly places the psalm in the exilic period. At that time Israel could no longer “enter his gates with thanksgiving” or worship the goodness of Yahweh in his temple. In verses 5-8 the psalm moves from the plight of Israel into a plea for deliverance. The psalmist begins by asking, “How long, O Yahweh? Will you be angry forever?” In verses 9-12, the psalmist pleads with God to deliver Israel. With imperative verbs the author demands from Yahweh: “Avenge your servants ... pay back our neighbors seven times”. And then, in the final verse the psalmist reasserts Israel's relationship with her God. If Yahweh restores Israel, then the psalmist says: “We, your people and the sheep of your pasture, we shall give thanks to you forever, for all generations we shall recount your praise”.

The climactic final verse of Psalm 79 draws heavily on the language of Psalm 100. First of all, v. 13 uses the key phrase, “we are your people and the sheep of your pasture”. This exact expression occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible. Furthermore, the clustering of terms from Ps 100,4 and 5 have influenced the language of Ps 79,13. These terms include “thanksgiving” (תודה) and “give thanks” (הודו) in Psalm 100 reflected by “we give thanks” (נודה) in Psalm 79; “praise” (תהלה) in Psalm 100 corresponds to “your praise” (תהלתך) in Psalm 79; and the expressions “forever” (לעולם) and “for all generations” (לְעַד־דֹּר וָדֹר) occur in both Ps 100,5 and Ps 79,13. This clustering of terms along with the statement “we are his people and the sheep of his pasture” suggests a relationship between the two psalms.

Yet, the ambiguity of Ps 100,3 is still preserved in the questioning voice of Psalm 79. Throughout the psalm, the author assumes that Israel is the servant of Yahweh (vv. 2,10) and contrasts Israel's relationship with that of the nations who do not *know* Yahweh (v. 6). If this is the case, then Yahweh must restore his people for the “glory of His Name” and to prove that He is God to the nations who ask, “Where is your God?” (vv. 9-10). Although the MT *Ketib* of Ps 100,3 which takes לֹא as a simple negative, “He has created us; but we are *not* his people”, was rejected earlier in light of the emphatic *lamed*, this statement nevertheless sums up the apparent

plight of the psalmist as he cries out to God. Indeed, when we remember the fluidity inherent in a liturgical text like Psalm 100, it would suggest that Psalm 79 may be playing on the possible interpretations of Ps 100,3. The very oral nature of Psalm 100 invites ambiguity and the resulting theological speculation. After all, if Yahweh is Israel's God, then why have the nations been allowed to invade Israel, why have they been allowed to desecrate Yahweh's temple, why have they been allowed to reduce Jerusalem to a heap of rubble? Although Israel may assert, as does Psalm 100, "Know that Yahweh is God", the nations mock Israel, a people who dwells in exile, and they mock their God, Yahweh, who is apparently unable to deliver Israel from the hands of the Babylonians. The psalmist's climactic assertion in 79,13 then is a response to the two explanations of Israel's situation: 1) as the nations would claim, Yahweh is not God; or 2) Israel is not his people (i.e., *Ketib*, Ps 100,3). The psalmist challenges Yahweh to restore his own name and to deliver his servants, and thereby prove that Yahweh is God and that Israel is indeed his people and the sheep of his pasture.

IV. Psalm 95, a Challenge to the People

Psalm 95 is another example of inner-biblical discourse with Psalm 100 which takes a rather different turn. The structure of Psalm 95 has long been a subject of discussion among scholars. The two parts of the psalm, vv. 1-7b and vv. 7c-11, seem at first glance to be almost unrelated; Wellhausen went so far as to say that the psalm was originally two unrelated fragments⁽¹⁹⁾. More recent literary trends have resulted in attempts to read the Psalm as a unity⁽²⁰⁾. However, the parallel (cited above) with Psalm 100 suggests another possibility for reading Psalm 95, namely, the final form of Psalm 95 is shaped by its dialogue with Psalm 100.

The primary connection to Psalm 100 is made in Ps 95,7, which most commentators have recognized as the key to unlocking the final form of the psalm⁽²¹⁾. We may translate verse 7 as follows, "For He is our God, and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand". This parallels, albeit not exactly, Ps 100,3: "Know that Yahweh is God; he created us. And we are his people and the sheep of his pasture". Instead of the imperative of Psalm 100, Psalm 95 begins with a statement of fact: Yahweh

⁽¹⁹⁾ J. WELLHAUSEN argued, "There is no link between the two halves of the Psalm. Probably there is no real connection between them; for the exhortation, vv. 8-11, accords poorly with the exultation of vv. 1-7" (*The Book of Psalms* [ET; New York 1898] 202).

⁽²⁰⁾ The psalm was incorporated into early Christian liturgy which already suggests that such a reading was possible, if not preferable; see recently P. E. ENNS, "Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3,1-4,13", *WTJ* 55 (1993) 255-280. For an exhaustive survey of literature on Psalm 95 see G. H. DAVIES, "Psalm 95", *ZAW* 85 (1973) 183-187.

⁽²¹⁾ For example, BRIGGS sees verse 7b as the key link between the two parts even though he essentially follows Wellhausen's view of the composition (*Psalms*, II, 310).

is God, and Israel is his people. In both psalms then we have the recognition of Yahweh as the true God and Israel as his people. Although the language is only loosely parallel, the implicit dialogue between Psalms 100 and 95 is underscored by the scribal tradition reflected in some Hebrew manuscripts which harmonizes 95,7 to follow more closely 100,3 (cf. BHS).

One major difference between the two psalms is that Psalm 95 highlights the conditional nature of Israel's relationship to God. Israel is “his people ... *if* they will obey his voice and not harden their hearts” (v. 7). The statement in Ps 100,3, “we are his people”, is ambiguous. Is it a reality based on God's creation of Israel, or is it a possibility conditional on Israel's acknowledgment of Yahweh? Psalm 95 clarifies, arguing that Israel's relationship to God is conditional on Israel's behavior and not, as in Psalm 79, on God's behavior. In order to be God's people, Israel must obey God and not be like the people mentioned in v. 10: “they are a people whose hearts go astray and they do not regard my ways”. To be sure, this interpretation accords well with the Deuteronomic school. For example, the Deuteronomic interpretation of the Dynastic Promise emphasized that the election of David and his sons was conditional on their fidelity to the covenant (cp., 2 Sam. 7,14-16; 1 Kgs 8,25). No less, according to the Psalm 95, was identification of Israel as the people of God dependent on their faithfulness to Yahweh.

We learn of the judgment for such a people in the final verse of the psalm: “They shall never enter my rest!” The original people to whom the psalmist refers are the people of Israel who came out of Egypt to wander in the wilderness, as we see in vv.8 and 9, and the “rest” to which the psalmist refers is found by the settling in the land of Israel. However, the psalmist's immediate audience was no doubt the Israelites who were in exile⁽²²⁾. The Babylonian exile was their Egypt and wilderness, and the psalmist enjoins them to listen to God's voice so that they may “enter into his rest,” that is, so they might again be his people and might return to the land of Israel.

V. Ezekiel 34, God is the True Shepherd

Ezekiel 34 is another text from the exilic period which reflects upon the relationship between Yahweh and his people⁽²³⁾. The entire chapter is a reflection on the disastrous influence of Israel's “shepherds” which resulted in the destruction of the land and the exile of God's “sheep” and

⁽²²⁾ The Egyptian exodus is often used as a metaphor for the Babylonian exile in exilic and post-exilic literature and in general the exodus was a preeminent event in the consciousness of ancient Israel; see S. LOEWENSTAMM, *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition* [tr. B. Schwartz] (Jerusalem 1992); Y. ZAKOVITCH, “*And You Shall Tell Your Son...*”: *The Concept of the Exodus in the Bible* (Jerusalem 1991).

⁽²³⁾ The exilic date is confirmed by the linguistic studies by Avi Hurvitz and Mark Rooker. Although both admit that there are later additions and glosses, on the whole Ezekiel fits into a transitional period in the Hebrew language. See HURVITZ, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (Paris 1981) and ROOKER, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: the language of the Book of Ezekiel* (Sheffield 1990).

God's ultimate in gathering of the scattered sheep. The chapter is widely regarded as composite, although there is little agreement as to the redactional history⁽²⁴⁾. There are no real formal grounds on which to posit a highly composite text and the promise of a Davidic successor suggests an exilic date of composition even to those positing a composite text.

Ezekiel 34 is, like Psalms 79 and 95, attempting to come to grips with the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of Judah. As a whole, the Book of Ezekiel is a balance between a critique of the people for past sins and a promise of coming salvation. Chapter 34 exemplifies this balance:

- vv. 1-10 Judgment against Leaders ("Shepherds")
- vv. 11-16 Restoration of People
- vv. 17-22 Judging among the Sheep
- vv. 23-30 New Shepherd (David) and Covenant of Peace
- v. 31 Liturgical Reaffirmation: "You are the Sheep of my Pasture"

Although there have been various attempts to dissect this chapter into sources and to discern various redactional hands, the only formal markers are the expression "and the word of Yahweh came to me saying" (v. 1) which opens the prophetic oracle and the expression "an oracle of the Lord Yahweh" in v. 30 which brings closure to the prophetic word. By formal criteria then, v. 31 stands outside the main body of the prophetic oracle. In fact, the expression "an oracle of the Lord Yahweh" also closes v. 31 and should be understood as an editorial repetition marking an additional reflection on the prophecy in vv. 1-30⁽²⁵⁾:

- 30 They shall know that I, Yahweh their God, am with them, and that they are my people, the house of Israel, says Yahweh God.
- 31 You are my sheep, the sheep of my pasture []⁽²⁶⁾ and I am your God, says Yahweh God.

⁽²⁴⁾ W. EICHRDTH suggests, "Verse 31 with its various explanatory glosses, which are not yet present in the LXX, must be an addition, since the preceding 'says Yahweh' prohibits all additional elaborations" (*Ezekiel* [OTL; Philadelphia 1970] 484). W. ZIMMERLI similarly argues, "The conclusion with its second recognition formula is once again formed entirely from Ezekiel's linguistic stock ... The main theme of Ezekiel 34 has disappeared completely in vv. 25-30 ... In this final sentence all polemic against evil shepherds has faded away to be replaced by the basic promise of blessing which is fundamentally present in all sections of the chapter: You, Israel, are my flock, my people, and, I am your God"; and, Zimmerli concludes, "One should most probably attribute vv. 25-30 and the redactional conclusion in v. 31 to the circle of Ezekiel's disciples" (*Ezekiel* 2 [Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1983] 221-222). The source critical model is taken to extreme by B. WILLMES, "Differenzierende Prophezeiungen in Ez 34", in J. Lust [ed.], *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interaction* (Leuven 1986) 248-254. Contrast M. GREENBERG's approach which emphasizes the use of sources and advocates the literary unity of Ezekiel, "What Are Valid Criteria for Determining Inauthentic Matter in Ezekiel?", in *Ezekiel and His Book*, 123-135.

⁽²⁵⁾ For use of this technique to mark an interpretative addition elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible see FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 85-88.

⁽²⁶⁾ I omit אֲנִי אֱלֹהֶיךָ following the Greek versions; the LXX would suggest that this expression is a secondary gloss.

Verse 31 seems to be a liturgical refrain which draws on Ps 100,3 and brings closure to this chapter on the shepherds. Verses 25-30 provide a context for Ezekiel's citation of Ps 100,3. These verses promise a restoration of Israel from their exile concluding in v.30 with an emphatic statement that Yahweh was their God and Israel was his people. This statement is expressed in the metaphor of Israel as the sheep of his pasture. There are three points of contact between Ps 100,3 and Ezek 34,30-31: 1) the declaration that Israel should “know” that Yahweh is God (also Ezek 34,27), 2) the claim that Israel is Yahweh's people (עַם) and 3) the use of the metaphor “sheep of his pasture”. These three elements are cited in Ezek 34,30-31 in the same order as they appear in Ps 100,3. The first two elements are rather generic and do not imply a use of Ps 100,3. The expression “they shall know” is an oft repeated expression which is usually associated with God's salvific acts; for example, just above in v.27, “and they shall know that I am Yahweh, when I break the bars of their yoke, and save them from the hands of those who enslaved them” (also see Exod 7,5; 14,18; 29,46; Lev 23,43; Deut 5,9). This contrasts with Ps 100,3 which relates “knowing Yahweh” with a creative act, “he made us”. Likewise, the assertion that Israel is Yahweh's people in Ezek 34,30 is far too common to suggest any linkage with Psalm 100. On the other hand, the expression “you are my sheep, the sheep of my pasture” in v.31 cannot fail to recall Ps 100,3. The use of the expression “sheep of my pasture” is quite unique in biblical literature and, taken together with the reaffirmation that Yahweh is Israel's God (אֱלֹהֵינוּ) suggests that v.31 knows and exploits the tradition in Psalm 100. The catalyst for this citation of Psalm 100 seems to have been the content of Ezekiel 34 in general and the language of v.30 in particular. Although the linkage between Psalm 100 and Ezekiel 34 has been suggested on textual grounds, it should not be construed as exegetical. The redactor of Ezekiel cites a liturgical text which echoed in the ears of the people.

The metaphor of the Shepherd and the Sheep in Ezekiel 34 provided another way to explain and cope with the Babylonian exile. The citation of Ps 100,3 in the concluding verse of Ezekiel 34 suggests that this text was a major source of reflection in this difficult period. The promise in Ps 100,3 that Israel was Yahweh's people had to be explained in the light of the Babylonian exilic reality. In Ezek 34,25-30 Israel's special relationship with Yahweh is reaffirmed. Verse 31 ties this reaffirmation to the promise of the preexilic thanksgiving hymn, Psalm 100.

VI. Conclusions

In sum, I propose that Psalm 100, a pre-exilic hymn of thanksgiving, was an important song in the pre-exilic temple service. An ambiguity was preserved in the liturgical tradition of the psalm and is reflected by the *Qere-Ketib*; this ambiguity served as a catalyst for exilic reflection on its central verse. Although Psalm 100 triumphantly proclaims Israel as the people of Yahweh, in the circumstances of the Babylonian exile, this proclamation must have sounded empty.

From the despair of this new reality rises a response to the promise in Psalm 100. In Psalm 79, the psalmist challenges God to restore Israel and prove to the nations that Yahweh is the Shepherd of Israel. It assumes that Yahweh is responsible for the tragedy and consequently demands that the Shepherd restore the sheep. Psalm 95 represents an entirely different view of the situation; the people — not Yahweh — are responsible for Israel's plight. Consequently, the psalmist challenges the people to listen to the Shepherd so that the Shepherd may again lead the flock into the land of their ancestors. Ezekiel 34 also deflects the blame away from Yahweh. Yet, rather than focusing the blame on the people, Ezekiel 34 condemns Israel's shepherds; that is, their leaders. It then asserts that Yahweh is the Shepherd who will restore the fortunes of his people and the sheep of his pasture. In this respect, Ezekiel's interpretation is implicitly an appeal to return to a theocratic and utopian society. The crisis of the Babylonian exile provokes reflection on the promise of Psalm 100, but the reinterpretation takes three different trajectories in Psalm 79, Psalm 95, and Ezekiel 34⁽²⁷⁾.

The investigation of inner-biblical discourse requires that we begin with diachronic observations and judgments. Although these historical critical judgments are sometimes difficult, they also afford the opportunity to glimpse into the discourse of ancient Israel. The payoff of historical analysis required by inner-biblical exegesis and discourse then far exceeds what may be gained by an ahistorical study of inner-biblical allusion.

Near Eastern Languages
and Cultures
University of California
376 Kinsey Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1511
U.S.A.

W. M. SCHNIEDEWIND

(27) This discourse also flourished outside the bounds of the biblical texts. For example, further reflection on the meaning of the image in Ps 100,3 continues in the Qumran community. In the Damascus Document (4Q266 D^a 18 v, 13; *olim* 4Q267 D^b) the interpreter plays on our psalm, writing: "and we were the people whom you redeemed and the sheep of your pasture". There is no reason to assume a direct relationship between Ps 100,3 and this Qumran text, but it illustrates a continuing discourse.

Fear of God, the Analogy of Friendship and Ben Sira's Theodicy

Fear of God and human friendship are frequent themes of Ben Sira, but they are not usually associated with each other or with his theodicy. His theodicy is better known for its teaching about evil in God's creation and providence⁽¹⁾. Evil finds its place in creation, where all God's works come in pairs, as the opposite of good (Sir 33,14-15)⁽²⁾. Evil finds its place in divine providence, where everything has a purpose, as the scourge of the wicked (Sir 40,1-11). If those who fear God suffer, it is because they share a common humanity and inhabit a common world with the wicked. By a kind of cosmic fallout the evils plaguing the wicked also afflict the righteous, but sinners seven times more (Sir 40,8). The account has a certain austere grandeur about it, but the sincere God fearer may be excused for finding it impersonal, not to say callous.

Ben Sira also repeats the traditional wisdom that the afflictions of the righteous are a test; see Sir 2,1; 44,20. Yet commentators on Ben Sira's theodicy generally pay scant attention to this aspect of his theodicy. Prato, for example, cites verses from chapter two only in passing⁽³⁾. This element of Ben Sira's theodicy is deemed only "part of the Deuteronomic theory of retribution that legitimated probationary suffering for the virtuous"⁽⁴⁾.

Yet subtly Ben Sira gives the theory an original turn through the analogy between fear of God and human friendship at Sir 6,16-17. In

(1) Recent studies are G.L. PRATO, *Il problema della teodicea in Ben Sira* (AnBib 65; Rome 1975); J.L. CRENSHAW, "The Problem of Theodicy in Sirach: On Human Bondage", *JBL* 94 (1975) 47-64.

(2) Numbering of chapter and verse follows that of J. ZIEGLER's definitive edition in the Göttingen Septuagint (*Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* [Septuaginta XII,2; Göttingen 1965]) except for 30,25-33,13a and 33,13b-36,16a. For these sections the numbering follows the order of the Hebrew, Syriac and Old Latin (Ziegler's numbers in parentheses). See P.W. SKEHAN - A.A. DI LELLA, O.F.M., *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York 1987) x, 56.

For the Hebrew fragments identified to 1900, the edition of R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, hebräisch und deutsch* (Berlin 1906), retains its value as does the same author's commentary, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt* (Berlin 1906). See also *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Jerusalem 1973) and F. VATTIONI, *Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, latina e siriana* (Naples 1968).

(3) The texts he discusses are Sir 15,11-18,14; 33,7-15; 39,16-35; 40,1-17; 41,1-13; 42,15-43,33.

(4) SKEHAN - DI LELLA, *Ben Sira*, 150. This judgment is typical of scholarly opinion since O.S. RANKIN, *Israel's Wisdom Literature* (Edinburgh 1936) 82-83. See also A.A. DI LELLA, "Conservative and Progressive Theology", *CBQ* 28 (1966) 139-154; N. CALDUCH BENAGES, "La sabiduría y la prueba en Sir 4,11-19", *EstBib* 49 (1991) 30, n. 20.

examining the analogy two things must be kept in mind. First, friendship is treated more extensively in Ben Sira than in any other book of the Bible: 6,5-17; 7,18; 11,29-12,18; 22,19-26; 37,1-6⁽⁵⁾. Second, Ben Sira's idea of fear of God is not, as had been generally thought, an impersonal dedication to the Law⁽⁶⁾. Rather, fear of God designates primarily a personal relation to God in humble and faithful devotion⁽⁷⁾. It should not be surprising then that Ben Sira sees a similarity between friendship and fear of God and the theme of testing in each.

The first instruction on friendship in the Wisdom of Ben Sira is found in Sir 6,5-17. It concludes a series of instructions beginning at Sir 4,20. Woman Wisdom passages at Sir 4,11-19 and 6,18-31 mark the section off from what precedes and what follows. There are lessons on what not to be ashamed of (speaking the truth, Sir 4,21-28), on how not to speak (blustering, Sir 4,29-31), on what not to rely on (one's own power and, presumptuously, God's mercy, Sir 5,1-8), on how not to speak (with a double tongue, Sir 5,9-6,1), on unrestrained appetite (Sir 6,2-4), and on friendship (Sir 6,5-17). The series has not the thematic unity of Sir 1,1-2,18 (wisdom and fear of God) or 3,1-4,10 (honoring parents and related behavior), but its pattern — several negatively formulated instructions are followed by one formulated positively — is characteristic of Ben Sira's style⁽⁸⁾.

The topic of the instruction on friendship is how to find a true friend, and Ben Sira answers: by testing. Verse 7 states the matter concisely:

Would you acquire a friend, acquire him by testing,
And be in no hurry to trust him.

Verses 8-13 support this advice by examples of so-called friends who abandon their friends in time of trouble. The passage concludes by praising the true friend, אהב אמונה, in vv. 14-17⁽⁹⁾. Sir 6,16-17 reads in the Hebrew fragments⁽¹⁰⁾:

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. SKEHAN - DI LELLA, *Ben Sira*, 187.

⁽⁶⁾ J. BECKER, *Gottesfurcht im Alten Testament* (AnBib 25; Rome 1965) 276-280, in an otherwise excellent monograph, retained the common opinion of fear of God in Ben Sira.

⁽⁷⁾ J. HASPECKER, *Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach* (AnBib 30; Rome 1967); L. DEROUSSEAU, *La crainte de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament* (LD 63; Paris 1970) 346-356.

⁽⁸⁾ HASPECKER, *Gottesfurcht*, 127-130.

⁽⁹⁾ G. KRINETSKI, "Die Freundschaftsperikope Sir 6,5-17 in traditionsgeschichtlicher Sicht", *BZ* 23 (1979) 212-233, studies the passage in detail but makes no reference to the implied analogy between friendship and fear of God. The analogy is overlooked by commentators generally. J. T. SANDERS, *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom* (SBLMS 28; Chico, California 1983) 82, writes: "In 2,1-6 Ben Sira explains that a testing is the necessary prelude to the acquisition of wisdom, and Fuss considers this similar to *PIns.* xii 14,22; yet this section of *Phibis* speaks rather of one's testing of different persons in different types of relationships. The two sections hardly deal with the same theme". Fuss seems nearer the mark in noting the similarity.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Hebrew verses 15-16.

צָרֹר חַיִּים אֱהָב אֲמוּנָה יִרָא אֶל יְשִׁיגָם
כִּי כְמוֹהוּ כֵן רַעְהוּ וְכִשְׁמוּ כֵן מַעֲשֵׂיהוּ

A true friend is a bundle of life
One who fears God will attain⁽¹¹⁾.
For as he is, so will his companion be,
And as is his name, so are his deeds.

The Greek, supported by the Syriac⁽¹²⁾, reads v. 17 differently:

ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον εὐθυνεῖ φιλίαν αὐτοῦ
ὅτι κατ' αὐτὸν οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλησίον αὐτοῦ
Who fears the Lord conducts his friendship rightly⁽¹³⁾,
For as he is, so also will his neighbor be.

The Hebrew lacks Greek-Syriac v. 17a, while Greek-Syriac lacks Hebrew v. 17b. Critics commonly prefer Greek-Syriac and judge Hebrew v. 17b an insertion from 2,18d (Syriac), but the choice between them is not significant for the argument pursued here. What is significant is that the reasoning is the same in both readings. Both assert that they who fear God will find a true friend because the God fearer will act as a friend should act, and the other will do the same. The two readings differ only in describing what it means to act as a friend should act. For Greek-Syriac it is conducting one's friendship rightly or bringing firmness to it. For the Hebrew it is being a friend in deed as well as in name.

Why is it that one who fears God will find a true friend? Verse 17 gives two reasons: (1) one who fears God will act as a friend should act; (2) the other will do the same. The second reason depends upon the maxim, "All flesh loves its own kind, and every human being its like", justified at some length by an appeal to experience in Sir 13,15-20. One who fears God will associate with others who fear God. But the weight of the argument falls on the first reason. Why should those who fear God conduct their friendship rightly or act as a friend should act? The answer must be that fear of God and human friendship obey similar principles and develop in similar ways.

A comparison between what is said of fear of God in the first two chapters of the book and what is said of friendship in Sir 6,5-17 reveals the nature of the similarity. Both topics are treated several times, but since to this point in the book, fear of God has been discussed only in the first two chapters and friendship only in Sir 6,5-17, these two places warrant primary consideration. And they contain the essentials of the analogy.

⁽¹¹⁾ The final *mem*, if not simply a mistake, is either enclitic or refers to the plural חַיִּים.

⁽¹²⁾ For the Syriac text, see A. M. CERIANI, *Codex syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus* (Milan 1874); *Biblia sacra juxta versionem simplicem quae dicitur Pschitta* 2 [Mosul edition] (Beirut 1951); A. M. CERIANI, ed. *Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano sec. fere VI photolithographice edita*, 2 vols. (Milan 1876-83); P. A. DE LAGARDE, *Libri veteris testamenti apocryphi syriace* (Leipzig 1861); B. WALTON, *Biblia sacra polyglotta* 4 (London 1657).

⁽¹³⁾ If εὐθυνεῖ translates Hebrew יָצִיץ as, for example at Sir 37,15b, then probably the meaning is "makes his friendship firm"; cf. Syriac גִּשְׁרִין.

A compositional feature of the first six chapters also draws attention to the links between Ben Sira 1-2 and 6,5-17. There are three sections, 1,1-2,18; 3,1-4,10; 4,20-6,17, in these early chapters, the last framed by Woman Wisdom passages at 4,11-19 and 6,18-31. Each of the three concludes with a comparison that likens the relationship between God and the human being to a different human relationship. After chapter six this is not the case. The similarity of the three concluding comparisons is striking when they are viewed together. (1) "Let us fall into the hands of the Lord but not into human hands, for as his majesty is, so also is his mercy" (2,18). (2) "Be like a father to the fatherless and in place of a husband to widows, and God will call you son and love you better than your mother" (4,10)⁽⁴⁾. (3) "A true friend is a life-giving tonic they who fear God will attain, for whoever fears God will conduct his friendship rightly; for as he is, so also will his comrade be" (6,16-17). The human relationships compared are those of power and subjection (2,18), parent and child (4,10), and friendship (6,16-17).

One of the two terms of the comparison in each of the three conclusions is the topic of the passage it concludes, but the other is introduced without preparation. Divine sonship is not mentioned before 4,10 nor fear of God before 6,16-17. Sir 2,18 differs only in that the topic of Sir 2,1-18 is the divine-human relationship of fear of God. In this case the conclusion introduces unannounced the human relation of power and subjection, "falling into human hands". The effect in each case of introducing the second term of the comparison unannounced into the conclusion is to draw a second context into consideration. Sir 2,18, for example, alludes to the passage recounting David's sin in census-taking, 2 Samuel 24. Sir 4,10 directs attention to a much more proximate context, the instruction on honoring parents in Sir 3,1-16. Just so, the introduction of the comparison with fear of God in Sir 6,16-17 returns the reader to the passages where that topic is treated in chapters 1-2.

Since Sir 4,10 links different contexts in close proximity to one another, it will be useful to consider the concluding comparison's function there first before examining the links between Ben Sir 1-2 and 6,5-17. Sir 4,10 concludes two instructions contained in Sir 3,1-4,10: (1) on honoring parents (3,1-16) and (2) on the behavior required of the rich (3,17-4,10). The latter is divided into two parts: (1) the attitude and actions of the rich toward what is greater than they (3,17-29, vv.30-31 are transitional); (2) their attitude and actions toward the poor and afflicted (4,1-10). The lesson on how to treat the poor is the immediate context for the concluding comparison. But v.10's parent-child language refers the reader to the instruction on honoring parents, and extends the comparison to the divine-human relationship: "Be like a father ... and God will call you son".

⁽⁴⁾ The Hebrew reads "and show you favor and save you from the Pit" instead of "and love you better than your mother". The argument pursued here does not depend on the comparison in the final colon.

The parent-child language, however, does more than provide a formal frame for 3,1-4,10. Applied first to the relation of the rich toward the poor and then extended to the human being's relation to God, it calls attention to an easily overlooked motif in this section: the paradox of relationship reversal. Parent becomes child, child becomes parent, rich act humbly.

After a routine beginning, Sir 3,1-16 introduces a specific situation in which the child is to honor parents: when they are aging and even senile (vv. 12-16). In this situation honor toward parents becomes *בן הקדש*, "the charitableness of a father" (v. 14). The Greek has *ἐλεημοσύνη πατρός*. The phrase is ambiguous. It can mean both "the charitableness of a father" and "charitableness toward a father". In fact what the child is required to do when his parents are old and senile is be like a parent to them. The second and only other time *בן הקדש* occurs in 3,1-4,10 is at 3,30 in the instruction to the rich and powerful. This lesson begins at 3,17-18 with the advice that the rich should humble themselves and make themselves small to win God's favor. Verse 30 reminds the rich that "as water extinguishes flames, charitableness (*בן הקדש* ἐλεημοσύνη) atones for sin". By praising *בן הקדש* to the rich and urging them to act *בבן* toward the poor, Ben Sira compares the relationship to that of the dutiful child to aging parents. That one becomes a child of God by becoming a parent to those in need is a final example of role reversal calling attention to the others in the section. The concluding comparison calls attention to the analogical thread connecting the sage's teaching on honoring parents and on the humble behavior of the rich.

The concluding analogy of Sir 6,16-17 functions in like manner to link friendship and fear of God. Fear of God is first mentioned in Sir 1,10 according to the Syriac⁽¹⁵⁾, in Sir 1,11 according to the Greek. The subject is treated under three headings: (1) the relation between wisdom and fear of God (Sir 1,10-25); (2) the acquisition of wisdom through fear of God and related behavior (Sir 1,26-30); (3) the appropriate behavior of one who fears God under trial (Sir 2,1-18). The similarities between fear of God and human friendship emerge under the second and third headings.

Sir 1,26-30 begin: "If you desire wisdom, keep the commandments, and the Lord will give it to you in abundance, for the fear of the Lord is wisdom and instruction, and he delights in faithfulness and humility" (vv. 26-27). Though keeping the commandments is mentioned first, the emphasis falls on faithfulness and humility, for the passage goes on to warn against their opposites, deceitfulness and self-exaltation (vv. 28-30). The admonition is framed by a warning against deceitfulness and double-dealing in vv. 28 and 30b. Faithfulness and its opposite, deceit or insincerity, are the same quality and defects that figure prominently in Sir 6,5-17. Though the Hebrew of 1,26-30 is lacking, it seems clear that *πίστις* translates *אמונה* at Sir 1,27. The same pair recurs at Sir 45,4 where *πίστις* και *πραυτης* translate *אמונה* ו*ענוה*.

⁽¹⁵⁾ HASPECKER, *Gottesfurcht*, 51-53, is probably right to prefer the Syriac here.

Chapter two continues the theme of fear of God, beginning with the words, "my son, if you approach the fear of God" (16). But now the warning against insincerity becomes urgent because of the threat of apostasy (Sir 2,2-4.11). One who fears God must be prepared "for trial, εἰς πειρασμον" (v. 1). A remarkably similar situation is envisaged by Sir 6,5-17 which advises the acquisition of friends "by trial" (ἐν πειρασμῷ = בְּנִסּוּיָא). The "trial" in question is of one's friends "on the day of your affliction" (Sir 6,8.10) or "when you are humbled" (cf. Greek 2,4 ἐν ἀλλάγμασιν ταπεινώσεώς σου and 6,12 ἐὰν ταπεινωθῇς). The perspectives, however, differ. Chapter two views trials from the perspective of the one being tested, Sir 6,5-17 from the perspective of the one making trial of friendship.

In time of trial steadfast adherence to God is essential (Sir 2,2.3.6.10). The verb εὐθυνεῖν, here too probably "make steadfast, firm", is used of the heart and one's ways at Sir 2,2.6. At Sir 6,17 the expression is εὐθυνεῖ φίλιαν αὐτοῦ (17). The danger is falling away (Sir 2,3.7) through timidity, fatigue or vacillation and loss of endurance (vv. 12-14). False friends will also fall away in the time of one's affliction. They "will not be there to help" (Sir 6,8.10) or will even turn against one and hide themselves (v. 12).

Yet while steadfastness is all important for the God-fearer in time of affliction, trust in God is what gives steadfastness its staying power (Sir 2,6-11). The verb πιστεῦν is used in vv. 6.8. But other verbs are also used, ἐλπίζειν, "hope" (vv. 6.9), ἀναμενεῖν, "wait for" (v. 7) and ἐμπιστευεῖν, "trust in" (v. 10). Trust is also essential to Ben Sira's idea of friendship. But trust is delayed until the friend has been tested: "Would you acquire a friend, acquire him by testing, and be in no hurry to trust him, וְלֹא תַמְהִיד לְבַטָּח עָלָיו" (Sir 6,7, καὶ μὴ ταχὺ ἐμπιστεύσης αὐτῷ). The trouble with friends is that many cannot be trusted (vv. 8-13). To find a faithful friend is precisely to find a friend one can trust. Again the perspective differs. The one on trial must prove trustworthy, to God on the one hand, to the one seeking a friend on the other.

Sir 2,1-18 concentrates on the necessity of being faithful to and trusting in God without overlooking that which inspires trust: God's own faithfulness. Sir 6,5-17 looks at friendship from the point of view of one seeking faithfulness and trust, only to reverse the perspective at the very end in a paradox reminiscent of Sir 4,10 by saying that acting like a friend is the way to find a friend.

There is one last way in which Sir 2,1-18 is connected with Sir 6,5-17. The link between אֱוִיָּה and יִרְאָא in Sir 6,16-17 has its counterpart in the link between οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον, "those who fear the Lord", and οἱ ἀγαπῶντες αὐτὸν, "those who love him", in Sir 2,15-16. Though the Greek translation of אֱוִיָּה in Sir 6,14-16 is φίλος, ἀγαπῶντες αὐτὸν at Sir 2,15-16 undoubtedly reflects Hebrew אֱוִיָּה. The Hebrew of Ben Sira

(16) According to the Syriac, which R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*. (Berlin 1906) 18, prefers; see also HASPECKER, *Gottesfurcht*, 56-57.

(17) The Hebrew fragments lack this half-verse, as has been said.

preserves no certain example of the participle אָהַב with God as object to compare with the Greek⁽¹⁸⁾, but the correctness of the restoration אָהַב at Sir 47,22 on the basis of Greek τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος αὐτὸν (cf. Syriac) seems beyond reasonable doubt. The identification of those who fear God as God's "friends" in Sir 2,15-16 is an explicit if easily overlooked use of the analogy of friendship already in chapter two.

Does a comparison between the stylistically similar conclusions to Sir 2,1-18 and 6,5-17 add anything to our understanding of the analogy of friendship? Here we come upon a curious feature of Sir 2,1-18. The concluding comparison alludes to David's choice of divine over human punishment for his sin of census-taking (2 Sam 24,14). The allusion to David's confidence in God's merciful exercise of power is apt as the conclusion of a passage which has emphasized the divine mercy. But there is nothing in Sir 2,1-18 that would account for the mention of "falling into human hands", the other term in the comparison. Is it only excess baggage carried by the allusion to 2 Sam 24,14?

This would be the most reasonable explanation, were it not that on closer examination even "falling into the hands of God" does not quite fit the context either. Although Sir 2,1-18 begins by warning of trial and so implies that human affliction has a purpose, the passage does not center on the explanation of human suffering. Quite the contrary, apart from the hackneyed "for gold is tested in fire and acceptable human beings in the furnace of humiliation" (v.5) and the passing mention of divine punishment on those who lose their endurance (v.14), there is no other reference to the cause or explanation of affliction. The passage is not an explanation of human suffering but an instruction on how to behave when it comes. Moreover, it presents God exclusively as the reliable deliverer from affliction, not as its cause for whatever purpose. It is noteworthy that neither in v.1 nor in v.5 does the text say that God tests but only that there will be trial, and human beings, like gold, are tested.

Yet the concluding comparison unmistakably introduces God as cause of human suffering. The effect is to give undue importance to the few references in the body of the instruction which seem an explanation of suffering. Or, to put it another way, the comparison introduces the question of the origin and purpose of suffering in the conclusion of a text which has not considered it.

Perhaps the conclusion of 2,1-18 in fact opens the text to interpretation by the analogy of friendship where the purpose of trials is evident. It is an important part of the dynamic of acquiring a true friend. In Sir 2,1-18 the purpose of testing is rather vaguely included in the phrase ἀνθρώποι δεκτοί in v.5, but the emphasis is on the faithfulness of the God-fearer which must be sustained in time of trial. What the analogy of friendship suggests is that God's purpose in testing is similar to the purpose of one in search of the אָהַב אֱמוּנָה. Nothing in the body of Ben Sira 2 says that God tests by

⁽¹⁸⁾ Sir 31,19 is only found in the Greek; see D. BARTHÉLEMY – O. RICKENBACHER, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Sirach* (Göttingen 1973) 44-46, for the list of occurrences.

bringing on affliction, nor is this the case among friends. Friends learn about one another by their behavior in difficult circumstances. Their friendship, as we say, stands the test of time.

In the case of fear of God it is only suggested by the analogy implied at Sir 6,16-17 that testing has a similar purpose. The closest Ben Sira comes to an explicit statement is in his use of another analogy in the personification of wisdom in Sir 4,11-19⁽¹⁹⁾. Those who are "friends/lovers" of Lady Wisdom (v. 12, אהביה) are subjected to trials in pursuit of her. Wisdom, "acting like a stranger"⁽²⁰⁾, will walk with him and will prove him by tests, בנסיונה, until I have his whole heart" (v. 17)⁽²¹⁾. The Greek makes the meaning clear: ἕως ὃς ἐμπιστεύσῃ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ, "until she trusts him". Then she will make him happy again by revealing her secrets to him, though if he abandon her, she will discard him (vv. 18-19). The analogy with courtship is evident, and the wariness of Wisdom the Woman matches that recommended in the search for a true friend. Trust is the goal whether the search is for one whose heart is wholly with Wisdom or for a faithful friend⁽²²⁾.

When the suffering of one who fears God is put in the context of friendship, the traditional concept of divine testing takes on a different look. It becomes a stage in the ordinary progress of friendship through faithfulness to complete trust. God in Ben Sira 2 is the reliable friend who is worthy of trust and will always come to a friend's aid. If God tests, it is not, as may be supposed, by inflicting suffering, but, like ordinary human beings, by being wise enough to realize that few actually remain friends in adverse circumstances and prove themselves worthy of full confidence. This is a very different attitude toward human suffering, an attitude "from below" it may be called, in contrast with Ben Sira's attitude "from above" expressed in his doctrine of the harmony of opposites. Yet it should not be excluded from consideration in any study of his theodicy. However unsatisfying, impersonal and hard his explanation of suffering on a cosmic scale may be, it becomes very humane when scaled down to a matter between friends.

In conclusion then, I have argued that the connection between fear of God and friendship established in Sir 6,16-17 implies an analogy which requires a comparison between Ben Sira's teaching on the two relationships, and in particular between Sir 6,5-17 and Sir 1,26-2,18 which are linked

⁽¹⁹⁾ N. CALDUCH BENAGES, "La sabiduría y la prueba en Sir 4,11-19", *EstBib* 49 (1991) 25-48, considers the context of testing to be that of Wisdom the teacher and does not mention the metaphor of courtship.

⁽²⁰⁾ The verb התכבד is the same used of Joseph feigning foreignness to his brothers in Gen 42,7. This seems the appropriate parallel since Joseph's purpose was to learn what was in his brothers' mind.

⁽²¹⁾ *Lit.* יעד עת ימלא לבו בי "until his heart is filled with me. i.e., whole-heartedly mine". Cf. Delilah to Samson, איך תאמר אהבתך ולבך אין אחי, "How can you say, 'I love you', when you don't trust me"? (Judg 16,15).

⁽²²⁾ J. MARBÖCK, *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira* (BBB 37; Bonn 1971) 101-102, notices the similarity between this passage and Sir 2,1-5 but does not connect it with Sir 6,5-17.

stylistically in the composition of the first six chapters of the book. On making such a comparison, it does indeed become clear that friendship is the analogue for the concept of fear of God as the sage develops it in the first two chapters. Faithfulness and trust are essential to both relationships, and the frequent defection of friends particularly in time of trouble makes necessary a period of testing in both. An understandable shifting of perspective between the two relationships, in one of which there is a divine partner, does not substantially affect their similarity. Finally, the concept of God as faithful friend who never disappoints makes, of the divine testing, the wise inquiry into whether the friendship is mutual.

81 St. Mary St.
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1J4
Canada

William H. IRWIN, C.S.B.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

ECKART OTTO, *Theologische Ethik des Alten Testaments* (Theologische Wissenschaft 3,2). Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1994. 288 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 39,80

Eine schwierige Rezension! Das zu besprechende Buch ist ein grossartiges Werk, daran ist gar kein Zweifel. Und doch bleibt an einem Punkt so etwas wie eine leise Enttäuschung. Es ist ein grossartiges Werk, das hohe Bewunderung verdient. Die Fülle des verarbeiteten Stoffs, der nicht nur dargeboten, sondern diskutiert und im Dialog mit der internationalen Forschung auf aktuellem Stand interpretiert wird, hat nicht ihresgleichen. Nach einer "Grundlegung" genannten Einführung, in der Verf. "Gegenstand und Aufgabe einer theologischen Ethik des Alten Testaments" und die Forschung seit Wellhausen skizziert (9-17), entfalten drei Hauptteile die ethischen Konzeptionen des A.T.: "Vom Recht zum Ethos im Bundesbuch und in verwandten Rechtsüberlieferungen" (18-116), darauf folgt die Ethik der Weisheit unter dem Titel: "Ethos und Schöpfungsordnung: Die Ethik der Weisheit" (117-174), wobei zuerst ein recht eingehender Überblick über die ägyptische und mesopotamische Weisheit gegeben wird (117-152), schliesslich werden die deuteronomischen und priesterlichen (P, Heiligkeitgesetz) ethischen Konzeptionen nachgezeichnet (175-263), wo auch ein eigener Abschnitt dem Dekalog als der Summe der Tora gewidmet ist (208-219), und wo am Schluss die Verbindung von Tora und Weisheit am Ausgang des A.T. (Jesus Sirach) zur Sprache kommt (256-263). Einige knappe Aussagen zur Verbindung von Tora, Prophetie und Weisheit in der Apokalyptik (Daniel) (264-270) bilden die Konklusion.

Diese knappen Inhaltsangaben lassen den Materialreichtum nur von ferne erahnen, der hier aufgearbeitet wird. Es handelt sich um ein Handbuch, das zu jeder behandelten Frage auf gedrängtem Raum jeweils eine überaus reichhaltige Bibliographie von hohem Wert, dann die wesentlichen Elemente der exegetischen Fragestellung und einen klaren eigenen Lösungsvorschlag liefert.

Leider lässt eine Besprechung keinen Raum für eine ins einzelne gehende Erörterung all der vielen Positionen des Verf., die er gelehrt und entschieden vertritt. Da es sich um eine Ethik des A.T. handelt, sind indessen einige Erwägungen zu den grundlegenden Optionen von O.s Werk am Platz. Für ihn ist Ethik ein Normensystem (10). So erklärt sich der grosse Raum, den die biblischen Rechtskorpora in seinem Entwurf einnehmen.

Vom Recht unterscheidet er das Ethos, das er als Normengefüge ohne Sanktionen bestimmt (83-84 u.ö.). Dazu treten Normenbegründungen, die im A.T. in der Regel theologisch sind. Sie füllen die Lücke, die das Ethos offenlässt, da es ohne Sanktionen ist: "mit dem Sanktionsmotiv (i.e. in der theol. Begründung) kehrt die Rechtsfunktion als Funktion Gottes in das aus dem Recht ausdifferenzierte Ethos zurück" (85). In der Weisheit lässt sich ein Ethos beobachten, das einerseits aus der Erfahrung des Lebens und andererseits, in der späten Weisheit, aus der Idee einer von Gott geschaffenen Schöpfungsordnung stammt.

Neben den Normen verwendet O. bes. häufig Begriffe wie "gelingen-des Leben" oder "geglücktes Leben" u.ä. Hier ist Ethik weniger als Normensystem denn als Anleitung und Weg zum Glück aufgefasst.

Geschichtlich gesehen sei das Normensystem des Rechts in seinen ältesten Bestandteilen ein Konfliktregelungsrecht, das ohne theologische Begründung ausgekommen sei. Es habe innerfamiliäre, innergemeinschaftliche und intergentale Konflikte ausgeglichen. Durch gesellschaftliche Differenzierung komme es zur Unterscheidung von "justitiablem Recht" und Gerechtigkeit, die forensisch nicht einklagbar sei und daher expliziter theologische Begründung bedürfe (86). Das Gefälle gehe im A.T. in Richtung einer fortschreitenden Theologisierung der Ethik und des Ethos (113 u.ö.). Darin sieht O. die bleibende Bedeutung des biblischen Ethos für heute: die "ethischen Grundorientierungen (i.e. in unserer "wertpluralen Industriegesellschaft") speisen sich aus den Wurzeln ihres religiösen Ursprungs" (115).

M.E. war indessen alles Recht im alten Israel wie in der Antike überhaupt stets von der Religion umfasst. Das zeigen z.B. der Prolog des Codex Hammurapi und im Bundesbuch der Eid (Ex 22,10) und das Ordal (Ex 22,8-9), durch die JHWH direkt als für das Recht verantwortlicher Garant in den Rechtsvollzug einbezogen ist, sowie die Todesstrafe (Ex 21,12-17), die ohne implizierte göttliche Ermächtigung undenkbar wäre, da sonst ja alles Töten absolut verboten ist. Dazu kommen Asylbestimmungen wie Ex 21,13-14, die, obwohl an dieser Stelle literarisch sekundär, nach Ausweis von 1 Kö 2,28-34 sehr alt sind, so wie die Rolle des Fluchs und der Reinigungsriten für Verbrechen, deren Täter unbekannt bleiben (Dt 27,15-26; 21,1-9), was aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach sehr alte Praktiken sind. Ferner ist das Sakralrecht auch nach O. eine der drei Wurzeln des israelit. Rechts (213). Bei dieser Sachlage ist es m.E. nicht angebracht, von fortschreitender Theologisierung des Rechts und des Ethos zu sprechen, denn diese waren stets und von Anfang an schon "theologisch" und religiös begründet, ungeachtet der Rationalität ihrer Einzelbestimmungen. Was wir feststellen, ist eine fortschreitende *Explizierung* der theologischen Implikate von Recht und Ethos.

Genügt es überdies, Ethos als Normen ohne Sanktionen zu bestimmen? Es fällt auf, dass die Propheten, abgesehen von Hos 11,1-9 (109-111), in dieser Ethik des A.T. nie als Quelle ethischen Denkens behandelt und dargestellt werden, was nach Wellhausen geradezu paradox wirkt! Gewiss erscheinen die Propheten als Gewährsmänner für das Versagen der theol. Begründung von Recht und Ethos in vorexilischer Zeit (104-109) und als Zeugen des sozialen Wandels in der jüdischen Gesellschaft der Königszeit.

Aber ein Ethos der Propheten hat O. nicht herausgearbeitet. Das mag mit seiner engen Definition von Ethos zusammenhängen. Ethos hat es doch wohl auch immer mit dem Bild vom Menschen als Individuum und in Gemeinschaft zu tun, das als richtig und schön empfunden wird. In Israel wurde dieses Bild nicht nur im Recht oder in Normen dargestellt, sondern auch von den Propheten geprägt und in den biblischen Erzählungen gestaltet. Es fällt auf, dass die narrativ dargestellte Ethik bei O. keinen Platz gefunden hat. Das Bild vom Menschen ist im A.T. durch den unausgesetzten Dialog mit JHWH charakterisiert, dem bes. die Propheten dramatischen und tiefen Ausdruck verliehen haben, man denke nur an Mi 6 (fehlt bei O.), Jer 1 und die "Konfessionen", oder an Texte wie Ex 1-4 oder Gen 22, usw. Die einseitige Konzentration auf das Normative im A.T. macht es aus, dass Verf. trotz seiner Fülle an Material die biblische Ethik etwas zu eng gefasst hat.

Inhaltlich befriedigt mich die der priesterlichen Sühnetheologie (219-229) gewidmete Partie am wenigsten, weil Verf. hier einige m. E. unhaltbare Positionen vertritt, die das Gesamtbild in Mitleidenschaft ziehen (es gäbe nur Sühne für unabsichtliche Sünden, "mit erhobener Hand" hätte die Bedeutung "absichtlich" [223], Sühne wäre erst nachexilisch priesterlich "als eine von Gott gnädig gewährte Sühneinstitution interpretiert" worden [225] u.a.m.).

Sinnstörende Druckfehler: 172, Zeile 2 muss das "Das" als "dass" verstanden werden? 210, Zeile 7-11: muss es heißen: "rückte" (statt "rückten")?

Das Buch ist eng gedruckt. Ein solches Werk hätte vom Verlag wirklich eine weniger knauserige, leserfreundlichere Aufmachung verdient! Es enthält ein Stellen- und ein knappes Sachregister.

Biblisches Institut
Universität Freiburg/Schweiz

Adrian SCHENKER

Ludger SCHWIENHORST-SCHÖNBERGER, *"Nicht im Menschen gründet das Glück" (Koh 2,24). Kohelet im Spannungsfeld jüdischer Weisheit und hellenistischer Philosophie* (Herders Biblische Studien 2). Freiburg-Basel-Wien, Herder, 1994. ix-358 p. 16 × 24. DM 88 – Ö 609 – SFr 78

En la introducción al presente libro el A. hace referencia a la imagen del péndulo para explicar gráficamente lo que ha sucedido en el último siglo a propósito de si el libro del Eclesiastés o Qohélet ha sido escrito bajo *el influjo helenístico* o no. Efectivamente se han sucedido las opiniones de los intérpretes siguiendo las modas intelectuales del momento como un oleaje permanente o un péndulo en movimiento continuo: influjo helenístico sí, influjo helenístico no.

El libro del Eclesiastés o Qohélet ha sido reconocido siempre entre judíos y cristianos como un libro incómodo por su contenido abiertamente

crítico ante todo lo comúnmente admitido en el medio sapiencial judío. Su autor tuvo que ser una persona muy singular, capaz de enfrentarse a cara descubierta a los representantes del poder y de la intelectualidad de la Jerusalén de finales del siglo III a. C.

La pregunta que todos nos hacemos, y el A. también se hace, es ésta: la actitud independiente y extremadamente crítica de Qohélet ¿se explica simplemente por un fenómeno de evolución interna por el que se llega a un enfrentamiento con el pensamiento tradicional israelita o se requiere además un influjo especial externo de parte del helenismo dominante en torno? El A. opina que en las circunstancias actuales es totalmente necesario plantearse de nuevo la pregunta, para intentar encontrar una respuesta adecuada, finalidad del presente libro (cf. 3).

El A. distribuye su trabajo en tres partes, bien definidas. En la primera comenta el libro de Qohélet en su totalidad, perícopa a perícopa y verso a verso, e intenta ofrecer una comprensión totalizante del libro en continuo diálogo con la investigación actual (cap. II-VII, 5-232). Es una preocupación constante del A., en esta primera parte, ver si todas las pequeñas unidades del libro giran alrededor de *una tema central* que garantice la cohesión interna. De hecho él piensa en el deseo que el hombre tiene de felicidad (125).

En la segunda parte, y guiado por los autores que han estudiado más a fondo a Qoh, el A. se introduce en el amplísimo mundo del helenismo, en su literatura y filosofías, para subrayar su estrecha conexión con el libro de Qohélet desde el punto de vista formal: el género literario de la diatriba, y desde el punto de vista del contenido: el problema de la felicidad del hombre (cap. VIII-IX, 233-273).

Finalmente, en la tercera parte el A. prácticamente recoge los frutos de su investigación anterior y determina el lugar que ocupa Qohélet entre la corriente interna de la sabiduría israelita y la externa que constituye la filosofía helenista (cap. X, 274-332). En general, el joven exegeta conoce bien la literatura moderna sobre Qohélet, pero tal vez manifieste demasiada dependencia con relación al parecer de algunos comentaristas (de N. Lohfink y de F. J. Backhaus en concreto).

L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger desarrolla cada una de las partes con suficiente amplitud y dominio de la materia. En cuanto a la primera parte del libro: el comentario completo a Qohélet, el A. es sumamente fiel al TM, en la interpretación del texto sigue una orientación coherente, alineándose abiertamente entre los que rehabilitan la figura de Qohélet: subraya apasionadamente sus aspectos luminosos como la estima de la creación de Dios, el amor a la vida, el disfrute de los bienes y la búsqueda de la felicidad. Pasa por alto, o simplemente minimiza sin negarlo, lo más negativo de Qohélet: su escepticismo, pesimismo y derrotismo, disolviendo tal vez la fuerza corrosiva de Qohélet dentro de las corrientes más generales y significativas del Helenismo: el cinismo y el epicureismo.

El A. aplica en su exégesis a Qohélet los criterios ya consagrados por autores como R. Gordis, el de las citas implícitas de presuntos adversarios doctrinales, representantes de la corriente tradicional de la sabiduría en Israel, a los cuales se opone el autor de Qoh con su crítica implacable. Con su

método riguroso de trabajo (ver el análisis estilístico y literario) en todo momento pretende demostrar la concatenación pretendida de perícopas y perícopas, debido a una concepción globalmente unitaria del libro. A mi parecer el A. paga aquí un alto tributo por aferrarse a una estructura impuesta al texto más que deducida de él, según la enseñanza de N. Lohfink que afirma una construcción perfectamente sistemática de Qohélet, «una sucesión de las partes del libro, lógica y retóricamente convincente» (N. Lohfink, *Kohélet* [Stuttgart 1980] 10), estructura arquitectónica del libro de Qohélet demasiado perfecta, lógica y occidental, para ser cierta en un libro tan antiguo y controvertido, precisamente en este aspecto.

Si analizamos críticamente la segunda parte del libro: Qohélet y el Helenismo, observamos en primer lugar que el trabajo del A. no es original, sino dependiente de los expertos del último siglo, cuyas conclusiones sintetiza a propósito del mayor o menor grado de influencia del Helenismo en Qohélet (233-244) y de la aportación de las corrientes filosóficas helenistas al tema de la felicidad del hombre, que es lo que preocupa a Qohélet (245-273). A la vista del callejón sin salida a que se ha llegado (grado mayor, menor o nulo de influjo helenístico en Qohélet), el A. ofrece modestamente en su trabajo «una pequeña aportación al esclarecimiento del problema» (245). En realidad, el servicio que el A. presta a los estudiosos en esta segunda parte del libro es grande, no porque haya descubierto algo nuevo, sino porque recoge los resultados dispersos de los especialistas sobre doctrinas fundamentales de autores y corrientes verdaderamente significativas en el período helenístico, relacionadas con el tema central de la felicidad del hombre según Qoh. Sus reflexiones y conclusiones sobre el género literario *diatriba* no convencen en conjunto (246-249). Una cosa es el conocimiento y la utilización de los recursos estilísticos de la *diatriba* cínico-estoica y otra muy distinta que a todo el libro de Qohélet se le pueda encasillar en el género literario *diatriba* (cf. J. Vílchez, *Eclesiastês o Qohélet* [Estella 1994] 61-62).

En cuanto a la última parte del libro sólo hacemos referencia a lo que para el A. es el centro de atención de Qohélet, el problema antropológico por antonomasia: la búsqueda de la propia felicidad (274), búsqueda que jamás será satisfecha y que equivale a una misión imposible (276). Es cierto que éste es un problema muy importante para el hombre según Qoh, pero que sea el que dé verdadera cohesión a todas sus reflexiones (278) es ir demasiado lejos. Esto supondría que los pensamientos todos del libro de Qohélet están concatenados como las premisas y conclusiones de un tratado moderno. Al parecer así piensa de Qohélet el A. pues habla de una *fenomenología* y de una *teología* de la felicidad (302) a propósito de Qoh 2,24, texto que da título al libro.

Por lo demás, la tesis que propone el A. tiene la virtud de entrelazar los problemas que a lo largo de un siglo se han suscitado a propósito del influjo del pensamiento helenista en Qoh. La afirmación de que la felicidad no está al alcance del hombre, tesis que defiende decididamente Qohélet (274), se enfrenta abiertamente a las corrientes helenistas estoica y epicúrea (251-263), pero no contradice al pensamiento israelita, con el que está de acuerdo, al menos en parte, pues es solamente Dios el que da a

quien quiere la felicidad (297-303). A su vez, la última sentencia, como la entiende Qohélet y la explica el A., está en contra del pensamiento helenístico, según el cual Dios (los dioses) no interviene para nada en los asuntos humanos (309). Por otros motivos muy diferentes también se opone Qohélet al pensamiento de la sabiduría tradicional israelita, ya que Dios da la sabiduría, la alegría, etc. a quien él quiere, no a quien se lo merece, considerando sin valor la tan repetida doctrina sobre la retribución (186-193).

De esta manera Qohélet ocupa un lugar crucial en la historia del pensamiento de Israel en lo que a la sabiduría se refiere. Pero el gran problema sigue siendo el mismo que planteábamos al principio: determinar en la medida de lo posible el influjo que recibe Qohélet del medio helenístico y del mundo sapiencial israelita. ¿Es tal la presión de la cultura helenística que Qohélet depende de ella en lo que tiene de más característico y fundamental? Sinceramente la respuesta no puede ser afirmativa, puesto que, como acabamos de recordar, tanto la *antropología* de Qohélet (en lo relativo a la felicidad) como su *teología* (relación hombre-Dios) son *toto coelo* diversas de las helenistas.

Sin embargo, del influjo del medio veterotestamentario sapiencial sobre Qohélet no se puede decir lo mismo. La concepción religiosa de Qohélet está plenamente enraizada en la tradición secular del pueblo, a pesar de su alto grado de escepticismo gnoseológico; y su concepción antropológica, que no es helenista, sólo se comprende al contraluz de la tradición sapiencial de Israel: en Qohélet entra en crisis profunda la visión optimista del hombre con relación a sus posibilidades de conocimientos humano-divinos, de la adquisición de la felicidad, de la retribución terrena y ultraterrena, de los valores con todas sus consecuencias en el orden ontológico, ético, moral, religioso, etc.

Llegamos así a la conclusión de que el A. no nos ha ofrecido una solución clara al problema de los influjos helenísticos sobre Qohélet, como se había propuesto en (ver 245). Nos ha dado, es cierto, más de lo mismo, es decir, al final vemos con más claridad que el libro de Qohélet es un fruto maduro del tiempo helenístico, pero con el sello inconfundible de un autor israelita que no renuncia a nada fundamental de su fe israelita.

Facultad de Teología
Apartado 2056
E-18080 Granada

José VILCHEZ

José VILCHEZ, *Sapienciales III: Ecclesiastés o Qohélet* (Nueva Biblia Española). Estella, Verbo divino, 1994, 507 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Nonostante il monito di Jacques Ellul, che apriva il suo saggio su Qohélet, *La raison d'être* (Paris 1987), affermando che bisogna avere una singolare vanità o una rara incoscienza per scrivere uno studio sull'Ecclesiaste, la bibliografia su questo breve scritto sapienziale (2987 parole) si sta negli ultimi anni infittendo. Lo attestava già la «Bibliographie zu Qohélet» raccolta da R. G. Lehmann in D. Michel, *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart des Buches Qo-*

helet (BZAW 183; Berlin - New York 1989) 290-322. E lo attesta ora il nuovo commentario di José Vilchez.

La metodologia e lo schema adottati sono quelli classici dell'esegesi storico-critica con un paziente spoglio della precedente letteratura a cui si fa riferimento. La lunga introduzione (19-119) affronta le questioni ben note sull'autore, sull'ermeneutica del testo, sulla sua dimensione letteraria (struttura, genere, stile, lessico), sugli aspetti storici (coordinate spazio-cronologiche e fonti) e teologici (canonicità e recezione cristiana dell'opera). Vilchez procede in modo cauto ed equilibrato, elencando e districandosi in modo abile ed essenziale in mezzo alla selva delle proposte. Talvolta questo procedimento «mediante» può rendere meno incisiva la tesi dell'autore. Così, parrebbe che Vilchez voglia schierarsi sul versante della «difesa» di Qohelet in sede ermeneutica generale, ma lo fa in modo non del tutto definito e con riserva: negli «aspetti positivi di Qohelet» si inserisce anche l'affermazione che «la vita non ha senso trascendente», creando così qualche tensione ideologica. Questo aspetto, infatti, potrebbe orientare verso una prospettiva antitetica, per altro riconosciuta come rilevante. Probabilmente sarebbe stato necessario definire in modo più netto questa scelta «di centro» che vuole equilibrare le interpretazioni pessimistiche tradizionali e quelle più recenti che fanno di Qohelet un «Preacher of Joy», per usare la fortunata (e a nostro avviso discutibile) definizione di R. N. Whybray.

Un altro punto sul quale Vilchez adotta questa linea «da crinale» è quello, particolarmente dolente, della struttura di Qohelet. In verità le principali proposte finora avanzate (intendiamo riferirci a quella tematica di H. L. Ginsberg, a quella stilistica di G. R. Castellino, ai «numerical patterns» di A. G. Wright, a quella ideologico-evolutiva di E. Glasser, a quella «polare» di J. A. Loader, alla concentrica di N. Lohfink e alla ciclica di F. Rousseau) sono quasi soltanto evocate: forse meriterebbero una discussione maggiore perché non prive di incidenze nella considerazione di aspetti rilevanti dell'opera di Qohelet. La proposta di Vilchez è articolata in 14 paragrafi la cui giustificazione letteraria non è poi nel commento sempre esplicitata e documentata (come avviene in alcuni casi: ad esempio, la suggestiva struttura chiastica di 5,9-6,9 a p. 281). A noi sembra che sostanzialmente sia stato adottato un criterio tematico, temperato da qualche rilevazione di stampo letterario, sulla scia appunto di quella «via di mezzo» a cui sopra si faceva riferimento e che è certamente postulata dalla finalità della collana.

Riguardo alla struttura di Qohelet Vilchez riconosce di non aver potuto attingere allo studio di V. D'Alario, *Il Libro del Qohelet. Struttura letteraria e retorica* (Supplemento alla Rivista Biblica 27; Bologna 1992). Qui si ha l'invito a percorrere un altro itinerario che usi la strumentazione dell'analisi retorica e che sperimenti anche un approccio sincronico, capace di comporre in un progetto quegli elementi formali offerti dal testo, del quale essi sono forse «codici» di strutturazione o comprensione. Naturalmente si tratta di un percorso non alternativo rispetto a quello finora applicato dall'esegesi storico-critica, ma certamente affidato a metodologie e strumenti differenti. Vogliamo aggiungere un'ulteriore considerazione riguardo a un altro approccio abbastanza recente al testo biblico, quello di *Wirkungsge-*

schichte. Vilchez ha dedicato alla questione due capitoletti della sua introduzione («Actualidad de Qohélet», 44-48; «Canonicidad de Qohélet», 94-101). È un contributo significativo che però meriterebbe di essere esteso oltre le brevissime considerazioni riguardanti i primi scrittori ecclesiastici e Teodoro di Mopsuestia e la stessa attualizzazione (a p. 225 si cita per Qohélet 3,1-8 un sonetto del poeta Ruben Dario). La *Rezeptionsgeschichte* per un testo così «sconcertante» e polimorfo come Qohélet è, infatti, molto fruttuosa ai fini di un'ermeneutica globale.

Abbiamo insistito sulle premesse dell'opera di Vilchez perché il commentario vero e proprio è conseguente ad esse ed è, in questa prospettiva, un contributo prezioso. Possiamo veramente riconoscere che in esso abbiamo anche un bilancio dell'esegesi qohéletica. Più che proporre nuove soluzioni alle varie «cruces interpretum», l'esegeta spagnolo preferisce vagliare le ipotesi, pesarne le argomentazioni e deciderne l'adozione. Così, ad esempio, per l'oscuro 5,8 egli si orienta sulla scelta di D. A. Garret, «Qohélet on the Use and Abuse of Political Power», *TrinJ* 8 (1987) 159-177; per 12,1, dopo aver reso conto delle varie ipotesi, opta con equilibrio per la «lectio difficilior» del TM; in 2,24b-26 si ha l'interpretazione abituale, ma forse si poteva tener conto di un'altra ipotesi, quella della citazione di un'affermazione sapienziale tradizionale da parte di Qohélet con un giudizio di vanità e un sottile «stravolgimento» (cf. D'Alario, *Il Libro del Qohélet*, 94-95). Interessante è anche l'uso cauto delle ipotesi filologiche di M. Dahood, come lo è per quelle ermeneutiche di N. Lohfink (ad esempio per 7,26-28 e la questione femminile).

L'opera di Vilchez, che comprende anche sei «excursus» (sul nome *Qohélet*, su *hebel*, sulla radice 'ml, sulla retribuzione, sulla «teologia» di Qohélet e sulla discussa semantica dello 'ôlam di Qo 3,11) e due appendici storico-geografiche sulla Palestina dei Tolomei e dei Seleucidi, è quindi un vero e proprio manuale che, pur non aprendo nuove prospettive, delinea il quadro della ricerca su Qohélet sceverando i contributi fondamentali e le tendenze più codificate. Rimangono quindi spazi aperti, ma lo «status quaestionis» è fatto proprio da questa analisi paziente e attenta. Per una riedizione o per eventuali versioni sarà opportuno procedere forse verso qualche nuova traiettoria e, come spesso accade, a una revisione di imprecisioni ed errori (solo per citare un dato che ci riguarda in modo esemplificativo, il nostro *Qohélet* non è stato pubblicato a Torino, come si dice a p. 103, bensì a Cinisello Balsamo-Milano e la sigla del nome è incoerente nelle note a p. 412). Nella bibliografia generale e nell'eventuale uso riterremo utili anche i commenti non citati di M. A. Eaton (Leicester-London 1983), di D. M. Eichhorn (New York 1963), di C. D. Ginsburg (New York 1970; citato senza titolo in nota a p. 80), di J. A. Loader (Grand Rapids 1986) e di A. Maillot (Lyon 1971), oltre naturalmente a quelli usciti dopo il 1993-1994 (così per gli studi specifici).

Ci sembrerebbe opportuno far riferimento anche a questi, tra gli altri saggi su Qohélet: W. A. Brindle, «Righteousness and Wickedness in Ecclesiastes 7,15-18», *AUSS* 23 (1985) 243-257; S. G. Brown, «The Structure of Ecclesiastes», *ETR* 14 (1990) 195-208; T. Glasson, «You never Know: The Message of Ecclesiastes 11,1-6», *EcQ* 60 (1983) 43-48; D. Kidner, *A*

Time to Mourn and a Time to Dance: Ecclesiastes and the Way of the World (Leicester 1976); J. de Waard, «The Translator and Textual Criticism (with Particular Reference to Eccl 2,25)», *Bib* 60 (1979) 509-529; O. M. Whise, «A Calque from Aramaic in Qoheleth 6,12; 7,17 and 8,13», *JBL* 109 (1990) 249-257.

Biblioteca - Pinacoteca Ambrosiana
Piazza Pio XI, 2
I-20123 Milano

Gianfranco RAVASI

Samuel A. MEIER, *Speaking of Speaking. Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible* (VTS 46). Leiden - New York - Köln, E. J. Brill, 1992. xvi-383 p. 24,5 × 16,5. Dfl 175,—; \$100.00

What is perhaps most amazing about this monograph is that it did *not* derive from a dissertation. For it contains the kind of microscopic and exhaustive data collection that one normally expects of the dissertation genre. Meier's work is a rich and detailed investigation of the mechanisms marking direct discourse in the Hebrew Bible. By markers of direct discourse he means "the presence of lexical items (verbs, nouns, particles) in a text that identify a configuration of words as reported speech" (1).

The chapter topics in this monograph are as follows: (I) Basic Issues in Marking Direct Discourse, including the differences between narrative and poetry, and unmarked direct discourse; (II) The Verb *אמר*, which includes an important section on *לאמר*; (III) Issues Associated with Selected Verbs, where he treats other verbs associated with direct discourse, including *דבר*, *החפיל* and *שבע*; (IV) Direct Discourse in the Prophets; and (V) Problems in the Marking of Divine Speech, including the formulaic phrases *יהוה אמר* and *יהוה נאם*. Throughout the study Meier is attentive to issues of genre and style of speech, and the difference between prose and poetry. He is also acutely aware of the different textual traditions represented in the Hebrew Bible and of the difficulty in analyzing an unstable text.

Many of the observations he makes will be useful in text analysis and exegesis. He notes that a major difference between prose and poetry is that direct discourse is not necessarily marked in poetry whereas it is almost always marked in prose. Medial direct discourse marking is common in poetry but exceptional in prose.

Meier argues that some form of *אמר* is obligatory before direct discourse in biblical Hebrew narrative (94). There are only thirteen cases of direct discourse without some form of *אמר*. Within his chapter on *אמר* he examines that pesky particle *לאמר*. He starts with the observation, one which has often puzzled investigators, that *לאמר* is always found before direct discourse, but not all direct discourse is introduced with *לאמר*. So why is it used when it is used?

Meier provides comprehensive lists of evidence in an attempt to sort out the distribution of *לאמר* and inflected forms of *אמר* including the

following: List A, verbs appearing only once before direct discourse and followed by לאמר; List B, verbs appearing only once before direct discourse and followed by inflected אמר; List C, unanimous evidence for לאמר in verbs appearing more than once before direct discourse; List D, verbs showing a tendency to prefer לאמר before direct discourse; List E verbs showing a tendency to prefer לאמר before direct discourse.

By his analysis the origin of לאמר as a characteristic marker of direct discourse is to be sought in its original infinitival function, meaning "to say", following certain verbs of communication. From this usage the function of לאמר was generalized to accompany any verb before direct discourse to the point that it simply became a particle that served unequivocally to mark the very next word as the beginning of direct discourse.

The data are exhaustive, yet the conclusion is somewhat unsatisfying. Meier's work might profitably be supplemented with a discourse analytic approach. The work of Cynthia Miller ("The Discourse Functions of Quotative Frames in Biblical Hebrew Narrative" cited on p.125, and her 1992 University of Chicago dissertation *Reported Speech in Biblical and Epigraphic Hebrew: A Linguistic Analysis*) contains among other things an examination of the discourse function of לאמר. She has shown that this particle plays a role in sorting out for the reader the source of a direct quotation from the one who actually voiced it, when they are not one and the same. It can also serve to identify a non-dialogic context of direct discourse from a dialogical one. In other words, לאמר tends not to be used in immediate conversational settings but rather in reports of conversations. Miller's work suggests that close attention to function can sometimes make sense out of otherwise inscrutable data.

Meier's observations on the treatment of divine speech and its development are notable. In early periods divine speech was marked no differently than human speech. But divine speech comes to be highlighted distinctively in certain narrative, poetic, and prophetic texts after the seventh century B.C.E. In a deliberate archaizing move certain biblical writers resurrected the second millennium Canaanite phrase נאם יהוה from the language of international diplomacy and used it to mark divine speech. Meier furthermore suggests that the variability in marking divine direct speech after the seventh century, especially the variable position of נאם יהוה within direct discourse units, is evidence that "the perception of the boundaries of God's word, along with the need — and means — to define it, was unstable and in a process of seeking resolution" (325). Though he does not develop the implications of these important observations, they may have canonical import.

Meier examines the phrase כה אמר יהוה found often with divine speech in prophetic literature, and argues, contra Westermann, that it does not derive from messenger speech and cannot be used in support of the metaphor of prophets as messengers. The phrase is not always used by messengers nor does prophetic literature of divine speech always use it. In fact, there are more cases of its use in non-messenger situations than in messenger contexts. Meier concludes that "the formula is simply used to

make citations of other's words" (284). The phrase has analogies to certain Mesopotamian epistolary conventions, and its usage is shown to be very close to the Persian royal proclamation style of the Bisitun text. This excellent discussion of prophetic speech forms is complemented by Meier's Harvard dissertation, which was published as *The Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 45; Atlanta 1988).

Meier claims that the single most significant observation resulting from his study is the "diversity within the Hebrew Bible" (323). In other words, the specific features of direct discourse marking can vary significantly from text to text, and even within a text. This accounts for both the strength and the weakness of Meier's study. On the one hand it is a precise and exhaustive catalog of the usage of direct discourse markers. On the other hand the study offers only moderate reward in the way of interpretive power or functional explanation, providing mainly empirical observation.

The study is admirable for moving beyond literary or midrashic rationalizations of linguistic phenomena by grounding analysis in empirical data collection. Yet Meier is so strongly controlled by the variability of the data that he is reluctant to proffer synthetic or generalizing observations. For instance, he warns that "any exegesis of prophetic literature that relies heavily upon a uniform construct in the perception of the marking of God's speech must be avoided. The markers of divine D[irect] D[iscourse] are unreliable as structural guides unless confirmed by other features within the text, for each text must be analyzed in its own right for the extent and manner to which divine speech is marked" (325). Though obviously not available to Meier at the time of writing *Speaking of Speaking*, one could cite the recent work of H. Van Dyke Parunak ["Some Discourse Functions of Prophetic Quotation Formulas in Jeremiah", *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. Robert D. Bergen) (Dallas 1994) who is unwilling to settle for free variation. He takes exception to Meier's evaluation of Jeremiah, that its means of marking direct discourse "are the most varied, unpredictable, and, quite simply, chaotic of any book in the Hebrew Bible" (258). Van Dyke Parunak demonstrates that the direct discourse formulas of Jeremiah have identifiable discourse level functions and identifiable meanings. Meier's work might have benefited from the functional approach to language that marks the growing field of Hebrew discourse analysis.

The work of Meier is admirable for the meticulous attention it gives to text and data. With its many lists and tallies of specific formations of Hebrew direct discourse phraseology it will continue to serve as a reliable compendium of direct discourse marking in Hebrew. Its 25 page scripture index will make it useful as an exegetical aid.

126 E. Tenth Street
Holland, Michigan 49423

Barry L. BANDSTRA

Novum Testamentum

Joachim GNILKA, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Supplementband V). Freiburg-Basel-Wien, Herder-Verlag, 1994. 470 p. 24 × 15

Den Bänden, in denen in Herders theologischem Kommentar die einzelnen neutestamentlichen Schriften in wissenschaftlicher Genauigkeit erklärt werden, ist ein fünfter Supplementband an die Seite gestellt worden, der willkommene Orientierung zu einem Überblick über das Gesamtzeugnis des Neuen Testaments bietet. Sein Verf. ist auf Grund einer stattlichen Reihe gelehrter Kommentare sowie zahlreicher Monographien und Einzelpublikationen auf das beste ausgewiesen, um der gestellten Aufgabe in eindrucksvoller Weise genügen zu können. Seine Darstellung zeichnet sich durch eine ebenso klare wie verständliche Sprache aus, die es nicht nur dem Fachgelehrten, sondern insbesondere auch dem Studenten ermöglicht, alle Schritte mitzugehen und der entfalteten Sicht sowohl hinsichtlich der Urteile zu einzelnen Fragen wie auch im Gesamtverständnis neutestamentlicher Gedankengänge folgen zu können.

Der Verf. hatte auf der einen Seite schon in einem Ergänzungsband zur Echter-Bibel einen kurzgefaßten Überblick zur neutestamentlichen Theologie veröffentlicht (Würzburg 1989), den mit dem nun vorgelegten, weit umfangreicheren Werk zu vergleichen sich lohnt. Auf der anderen Seite hat er bereits in einem dritten Supplementband zu Herders Kommentar Botschaft und Geschichte Jesu von Nazaret eingehend beschrieben (Freiburg 1990). Auf diesen Band wird vom Verf. ausdrücklich verwiesen (11) — ein Hinweis, den zu beachten um so wichtiger ist, als in der neutestamentlichen Theologie nicht noch einmal die Verkündigung Jesu — weder als ihr Bestandteil noch als ihre Voraussetzung — erörtert wird.

In einem ersten Paragraphen, der "Einführende Gedanken" enthält, begründet der Verf. den Weg, den er zur Entfaltung einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments gewählt hat. Er beginnt mit dem Apostel Paulus als dem frühesten literarischen Zeugen und folgt dann in etwa einer chronologischen Ordnung, indem nacheinander die Synoptiker, das johanneische Schrifttum, die nachpaulinische Theologie, die Apokalypse und die Kirchenbriefe gründlich betrachtet werden. Mit dieser Folge der großen Abschnitte trägt der Verf. in vollem Umfang den Einsichten Rechnung, wie sie die neutestamentliche Einleitungswissenschaft gewonnen hat, und ordnet die einzelnen theologischen Entwürfe der urchristlichen Zeugen in die Geschichte des Urchristentums ein, aus der sie hervorgegangen sind. Wird dabei darauf verzichtet, eine Theologie der Urgemeinde zu entwerfen — weil es für sie keine unmittelbaren literarischen Zeugnisse gibt —, so erörtert der Verf. doch zu Anfang eines jeden Kapitels zunächst die Frage nach den Vorgaben, die den Texten in der mündlichen Tradition vorausgegangen sind. Auf diese Weise wird deutlich herausgearbeitet, welche Überlieferungen und geprägten Wendungen den einzelnen Autoren zur Verfügung gestanden haben und auf welche Weise sie aufgenommen, interpretiert und verarbeitet worden sind.

Bei der Würdigung der verschiedenen theologischen Entwürfe, die im Kanon des Neuen Testaments zusammengefaßt worden sind, wird sorgfältig darauf geachtet, die zentralen theologischen Themen hervorzuheben und genau zu charakterisieren. Anthropologie, Christologie, Soteriologie, Ekklesiologie und Eschatologie werden dabei in ihrer fundamentalen Bedeutung herausgearbeitet, so daß ungeachtet der Vielfalt aufgenommener Fragen und ausgeführter Gedanken einige Grundlinien immer wieder sichtbar werden, die sich durch die verschiedenen Schriftenkreise hindurchziehen und auf ein gemeinsames Zeugnis zulaufen, das der Vielgestaltigkeit zugrundeliegt.

Der Verf. zeigt sich in allen Teilen seines Buches in gleicher Weise als in hervorragender Weise sachkundig — keineswegs nur in den vielen Bereichen, in denen er sich auf eigene Veröffentlichungen stützen kann. So sei hinsichtlich der exakten Berücksichtigung, die den Ergebnissen historischer Kritik zuteil wird, die Einführung in die nachpaulinische Theologie als Beispiel genannt. Hier wird nicht nur zwischen Proto- und Deuteropaulinen unterschieden, sondern auch mit vollem Recht darauf aufmerksam gemacht, daß es innerhalb des deuteropaulinischen Schrifttums beachtliche Unterschiede gibt — zwischen Kolosser- und Epheserbrief einerseits und Pastoralbriefen andererseits (325). In den Pastoralbriefen aber begegneten wir vermutlich jenem neutestamentlichen Autor, „der am stärksten von Vorgaben und Traditionen abhängig ist. Diese betreffen nicht nur Glaubenssätze theologischen und/oder christologischen Inhalts, sondern auch liturgische Formeln und ganz praktische Gemeinderegeln“ (350). Diese Einsichten werden dann bei der Darstellung der einzelnen Texte berücksichtigt, ohne jedoch einzelne Autoren gering zu schätzen. Indem vielmehr der Charakter jeder Schrift mit vorbildlicher Sorgfalt beschrieben wird, kann dann auch ihre jeweilige Botschaft angemessen zu Gehör gebracht werden.

Stets gut begründetes Urteil zeichnet alle Abschnitte des Buches aus, in denen die theologischen Positionen der einzelnen neutestamentlichen Autoren entfaltet werden. Als Beispiel seien einige Hinweise gegeben, die die johanneische Theologie betreffen. So heißt es vom Parakleten, er wirke wie Jesus: „Es ist dieselbe Offenbarung, die er in Erinnerung ruft, es ist dieselbe Wahrheit, in die er leitet, es ist dasselbe Zeugnis, das er ablegt. Er ist ganz vom erhöhten Christus abhängig. Wie der irdische Jesus den Vater zur Sprache brachte, so der Paraklet den erhöhten Herrn“ (293-294). Mit wenigen Strichen ist damit die Rolle des Parakleten treffend beschrieben. Gleiches gilt von der Eschatologie bei Johannes, die ein „räumlich-präsenstes und ein zeitlich-zukünftiges“ Konzept in sich schließt. Die Frage, ob diese sich miteinander vereinbaren lassen, wird offen gelassen, aber die klare Feststellung getroffen: „Auf jeden Fall hat das erste als das spezifisch johanneische zu gelten“ (296). Denn „Christus ist in der Tat das eschatologische Ereignis, das aus dem Tod und aus der Finsternis befreit“ (297). Im Blick auf die Ekklesiologie wird dann der enge Zusammenhang mit der Christologie hervorgehoben: „Christus ist sowohl der Hirt als auch der Weinstock. Zur Gemeinschaft gelangt man durch den Anschluß an ihn, sei es, daß man aus dem Judentum oder dem Heidentum zu ihm kommt.

Das sind — im Bild gesprochen — die beiden Höfe, aus denen die Schafe heraus- und zusammengeführt werden" (306).

Hat der Leser die Darstellung der verschiedenen "Theologien", die innerhalb des Neues Testaments miteinander verbunden sind, durchgearbeitet, so ist er gut beraten, den einführenden Paragraphen noch einmal aufmerksam zu studieren und ihn mit der Schlußbetrachtung zusammenzunehmen. Sie faßt in prägnanter Kürze die Ergebnisse zusammen und zieht einige Schlußfolgerungen von grundsätzlicher Art. Neutestamentliche Theologie wird definiert "als Beschreibung des rettenden Handelns Gottes in Jesus Christus, wie es im Neuen Testament oder: in seinen einzelnen Schriften bezeugt wird" (9). Die zentrale Botschaft des Kerygmas von Kreuz und Auferstehung Jesu Christi wird in den einzelnen Schriftenkreisen in verschiedener Weise entfaltet, wobei die urchristlichen Zeugen offen sind "gegenüber den Bezeugungen Gottes im Alten Bund" (10). Das aber schließt die Einsicht ein, "daß das Alte dem Neuen vorgegeben ist". Doch zu beachten ist: "Schlüssel für das Verständnis des Alten wird jetzt das Neue" (10). Mit diesen knappen Feststellungen sind neuere Bemühungen um das Verständnis einer biblischen Theologie treffend aufgenommen worden. Die verschiedenen Verbindungslinien werden dann in den einzelnen Abschnitten aufgezeigt. Denn die Theologie des Neuen Testaments — diese grundsätzliche Feststellung wird gleich zu Anfang getroffen — "stellt sich als eine Vereinigung von Theologien dar" (14).

Wie aber läßt sich diese Vereinigung begreifen? Versuchen, voreilige Harmonisierungen oder eine vereinheitlichende Systematisierung vorzunehmen, widerspricht der Verf. mit überzeugenden Gründen (454). Der Exeget hat der Einsicht standzuhalten, daß wir es im Neuen Testament mit "verschiedenen Konzeptionen der einzelnen Dokumente" und "einer Fülle von Modellen" zu tun haben (ebda.). Nur wenn diesem Befund Rechnung getragen wird, kann in angemessener Weise die Frage erörtert werden, "was die Verschiedenheit verbindet" (ebda.). Die konzentriert vorgetragenen Gedanken, die die Schlußbetrachtung enthält, wollen mit besonderer Aufmerksamkeit bedacht werden. In ebenso einsichtiger wie überzeugender Weise skizziert der Verf. die Grundzüge, wie sie in den einzelnen Schriftenkreisen zu erkennen sind — im Blick auf ein vielfältiges Christusbild, die jeweils vorliegende Sicht des Menschen, das Verständnis der Rettung des Menschen, die Eschatologie, die Lehre von der Kirche, das Verhältnis zu Israel, die Bedeutung von Taufe und Eucharistie und ein sich wandelndes Glaubensverständnis. In der Fülle der verschiedenen Konzeptionen erscheint manches als unvereinbar. Der Verf. verweist deshalb mit schlüssiger Begründung die Darstellung des 2. Thessalonicher- und des Jakobusbriefes in zwei Exkurse — weil der erstere sich mit einer einzigen Frage, der nach der Parusie, beschäftigt und weil der christliche Rang des Jakobusbriefes umstritten ist (15, Anm. 17). Mit dieser Beurteilung wird durchaus kritisch zwischen den einzelnen Theologien gewichtet.

Im Vordergrund der Darstellung steht jedoch die Hervorhebung des einenden Bandes, das die verschiedenen Dokumente miteinander verknüpft. Es ist nicht in der Verschiedenheit der Texte selbst, sondern in ihren Vorgaben zu suchen: dem Kerygma von Tod und Auferweckung Jesu (462-463).

In ihm wird der Grund unserer Erlösung ausgedrückt — Prinzip und Quelle, "aus der die neutestamentliche Theologie in ihren zahlreichen Ausfaltungen entstanden ist" (463).

Wird die Entfaltung neutestamentlicher Theologie in dieser Weise verstanden, so kann es nicht darum gehen, die verschiedenen Positionen miteinander auszugleichen. "Die Aufgabe bestünde vielmehr darin, in den Auslegungsprozeß, der ja faktisch auch immer fortgeführt wurde, einzusteigen und die aus den neutestamentlichen Schriften geschöpften Glaubenserfahrungen aufzugreifen und mit unseren Glaubenserfahrungen, Notwendigkeiten und Nöten zu konfrontieren, sie wirksam werden zu lassen und zu übersetzen. Was die Vielfalt der neutestamentlichen Theologie uns lehrt, ist die Fortführung des Auslegungsprozesses im Bewußtsein seiner definitiven Unabgeschlossenheit" (464).

Hatte der Verf. eingangs darauf hingewiesen, daß der neutestamentliche Kanon bis heute über alle Konfessionsgrenzen hinweg allgemeine kirchliche Anerkennung genießt (12), so hat er im Verfolg seiner Ausführungen diesen ökumenischen Aspekt niemals aus dem Auge gelassen. Seinem exegetischen Urteil und seiner umsichtigen Darstellung neutestamentlicher Theologie gelten hohe Anerkennung und großer Dank. Denn sein Werk wird der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der weltweiten Christenheit überall hoch zu schätzende Dienste erweisen: als eine ausgezeichnete Zusammenfassung weithin konsensfähiger Einsichten in der Auslegung der Schriften des Neuen Testaments und zugleich als eine wissenschaftliche Leistung von besonderem ökumenischen Rang.

Ernst-Curtius-Weg 7
D-37075 Göttingen

Eduard LOHSE

Dale C. ALLISON, *The New Moses. A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1993, XVI-396 p. 14,5 × 22,5

Diese ungemein gründliche und materialreiche Monographie ist ein Nebenprodukt aus der Arbeit an dem großen Matthäus-Kommentar, den der Verf. gemeinsam mit W.D. Davies schreibt und von dem bislang zwei umfangreiche Bände vorliegen. Es geht dabei aber auf alle Fälle um mehr als nur eine Entlastung des Kommentars von Materialien und Ausführungen zu einem Teilthema, sondern um eine in mancher Hinsicht sachlich über den Kommentar hinausführende Studie, deren Thematik auf Grund ihres Eigengewichts geradezu nach einer monographischen Darstellung ruft. Ihr Gegenstand ist, wie der Verf. scharf pointiert bemerkt, "a typology whose very existence can be doubted" (18 A 27). Neuere Kommentare und Untersuchungen zu Matthäus erweisen sich nämlich als ausgesprochen skeptisch gegenüber der Annahme typologischer Bezüge auf Mose im MtEv. Dieser Skepsis den Boden zu entziehen und, ganz allgemein, Kriterien für das Erkennen und Beurteilen von Typologien zu gewinnen ist das Ziel dieses Buches.

Der dabei gewählte Weg läßt sich am besten als pragmatisch-induktiv charakterisieren. Auf grundsätzliche Erwägungen über Wesen und Struktur von Typologie wird verzichtet; nirgends findet sich der Versuch einer Definition. Das hat den unbestreitbaren Vorteil, daß dadurch das Beobachtungsfeld nicht vorschnell eingeengt wird (auf seine Nachteile wird abschließend einzugehen sein). Der ganze weite Bereich zwischen expliziter Bezugnahme und indirekter Anspielung eines Textes auf einen ihm zeitlich vorausliegenden früheren Text wird einbezogen. Und zwar werden sechs verschiedene Möglichkeiten solcher Bezugnahme auf der sprachlichen Ebene unterschieden (19-20): (1.) Explizite vergleichende Stellungnahme (z. B. Joh 3,14); (2.) inexplizite Zitierung (z. B. Mt 2,20 = Ex 4,19); (3.) Ähnlichkeit der Umstände; (4.) Aufnahme von Schlüsselworten bzw. -formulierungen; (5.) Ähnlichkeit der Erzählstruktur (z. B. Mk 1,16-20//1 Kön 19,19-21); (6.) Abfolge von Wörtern und Silben, poetische Resonanz (z. B. John 1,1 → Gen 1,1). Um eine vom Autor tatsächlich intendierte Bezugnahme wahrscheinlich zu machen, sind darüber hinaus noch weitere Kriterien zu bedenken. So sollte der Nachweis erbracht werden, daß der Bezugstext einem Buch oder einer Tradition zugehört, die dem zu untersuchenden Werk zeitlich vorausliegen (was sich allerdings für ntl. Schriften von selbst versteht), daß diese für den Autor bedeutsam waren, daß der Typus ein gewisses Maß an Prominenz besitzt, sowie daß seine konstituierenden Elemente auch in anderen Schriften begegnen (21-22). Unübliche Bilder und ungewöhnliche Motive sind ein besonders deutlicher Hinweis auf das Vorliegen von Typologie (23).

Mit diesen methodischen Erwägungen wird der Ort der Fragestellung innerhalb der historischkritischen Methodik festgeschrieben. Es geht ausschließlich darum, das Verständnis des Autors der jeweiligen Schrift zu ermitteln, wobei allerdings dieses Vorhaben insofern an Grenzen stößt, als viele für diesen Autor selbstverständliche Bezüge aus dem Horizont seines heutigen Interpreten entschwunden sind.

In Teil I der Untersuchung ("Moses as a Type outside Matthew") werden typologische Bezugnahmen auf Mose im AT und im außerkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttum analysiert. Dabei zeigt sich ein weitgefächertes Deutungsspektrum, das seinen Grund in der Zuschreibung verschiedenartiger Ämter und Funktionen an Mose in der Tradition hat. So werden Josua und Josia als Führer oder Könige, Gideon und der Messias als Retter oder Befreier, Esra, Ezechiel und Hillel als Lehrer oder Offenbarer des Gesetzes in seine Nähe gerückt. Auf Jeremia und den deuterocesajanischen Gottesknecht werden Züge der Mosegestalt übertragen, weil sie, gleich ihm, Mittler und leidende Profeten waren (91). Schon dieser Befund spricht gegen die häufig geäußerte Vermutung, die Parallelen zwischen Jesus und Mose bei Matthäus seien einlinig messianisch oder als Erfüllung von Dtn 18,15.18 zu deuten (92). Betont wird ferner, daß zwischen Typus und Antitypus keineswegs ein vollständiges Entsprechungsverhältnis herrschen muß. Es genügt das Vorhandensein einiger signifikanter Übereinstimmungspunkte.

Dieser Befund findet anhand altkirchlicher Mosetypologien eine weitgehende Bestätigung. Auch hier nämlich läßt sich eine Multiplizität der Bezüge aufweisen. So wurden Gregor Thaumaturgos, Jakobus von Nisbis und

Benedikt von Nursia wegen ihrer Wundertätigkeit mit Mose verglichen. Bei Basilius dem Großen wie auch beim Kaiser Konstantin war jedoch die ihnen zugemessene signifikante Rolle in der Heilsgeschichte dafür maßgebend. Ephraem der Syrer wiederum wurde wegen seiner Tugenden, seines festen Charakters und seiner Führungsfähigkeit als Antityp des Mose gezeichnet (131). Ein gewisser Unterschied zwischen jüdischen und christlichen Mosetypologien besteht jedoch darin, daß die letzteren expliziter und weniger subtil sind. Als Ursache dafür ist eine im Vergleich mit dem Judentum deutlich reduzierte Schriftkenntnis zu vermuten (132-133).

In Teil II ("The New Moses in Matthew") werden jene Stellen des MtEv, die Anlaß zur Vermutung einer Mosetypologie geben, eingehend unter Einsatz des üblichen kritischen Instrumentariums besprochen. Naturgemäß nehmen dabei die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichten (Mt 1,18-2,23) breiten Raum ein. Der Verf. stimmt hier zwar dem verbreiteten Urteil zu, daß die Mose-Typologie hier bereits auf die von Mt aufgenommenen Traditionen zurückgehe. Er kann jedoch deren bewußte Adaption und Weiterführung durch den Evangelisten wahrscheinlich machen. Hauptindiz dafür ist die Aufnahme des Reflexionszitates aus Hos 11,1 in Mt 2,15. Die traditionelle Mosetypologie wird hier durch eine redaktionelle Israeltypologie kommentiert. Allein dadurch wird ein übergreifender Bezug der typologisch verstandenen Kindheitsgeschichte zum Exodus hergestellt: Wie die Rettung des Kindes Mose der Beginn des rettenden und befreienden Handelns Jesu an Israel war, so ist nunmehr die Rettung Jesu der Beginn eines neuen Erlösungsgeschehens (165). In der Versuchungsgeschichte (Mt 4,1-11) verhält es sich insofern umgekehrt, als hier eine vorgegebene Mosetypologie durch den Evangelisten mit spezifischen Mose-Motiven (vor allem dem Hinweis auf das vierzig tägige Fasten [V.2]) angereichert wird (166). Sehr differenziert ist das Urteil über Mt 5,1-2: Zwar handelt es sich hier um ein "Mosaic preface"; der Berg verweist auf den Sinai und Jesu Sitzen auf das Bild des autoritativen Gesetzgebers (180), was durch Mt 5,17-48 zusätzlich bestätigt wird. Allerdings ist eine Entsprechung zur jüdischen Vorstellung einer Inthronisation des Mose auf dem Sinai nicht aufweisbar (179). Die fünffach bei Mt erscheinende Abschlußformel (7,28; 11,1; 13,53; 19,1; 26,1) καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους kann freilich nicht als Indiz dafür gelten, daß Mt durch die Hervorhebung von fünf Jesusreden eine literarische Parallele zum Pentateuch habe herstellen wollen. Die berühmte These von B.W. Bacon (mit deren Implikationen sich der Verf. in einem eigenen Nachtragsabschnitt [Appendix I] auseinandersetzt) wird durch diesen sorgfältigen Nachweis destruiert — hoffentlich endgültig (194). Weder im Wunderzyklus (Mt 8-9) noch in der Aussendungsrede (Mt 10) vermag der Verf. stichhaltige Indizien für eine Mose-bzw. Exodustypologie zu entdecken. Anders verhält es sich mit dem großen Dankgebet Jesu (Mt 11,25-30). Dieses ist in allen seinen Teilen "a christological monument", unter dem drei wichtige Texte über Mose begraben sind (219), nämlich Ex 33,11-13; Num 12,1-8 und Dtn 34,9-18, deren gemeinsames Thema die wechselseitige Vertrautheit zwischen Mose und Gott ist. Hier soll gezeigt werden: Jesus empfangt — Mose gleich — nicht nur Offenbarung von Gott, sondern gab sie auch weiter (231). Beide stehen so im Ausgangspunkt

tradiierter Offenbarung. Bei einer Reihe weiterer Stellen fällt das Urteil eher negativ aus. So steht in Mt 12,15-21 die Deutung Jesu als des Gottesknechtes durch das Zitat aus Jes 53,12 eindeutig im Vordergrund. Für die weitergehende Vermutung, daß damit zugleich auf in Ex und Num häufige Bezeichnung des Mose als *ʿebed/παῖς* angespielt sei, liefert der Text jedoch keinen Anhaltspunkt (235). In 12,38; 16,1 (Zeichenforderung) läßt sich Mt sogar die naheliegende Möglichkeit eines Bezugs auf die Konfrontation des Mose mit den ägyptischen Zauberern (Ex 8,18-19) überraschenderweise entgehen (237-238). Ähnlich verzichtet er darauf, in der Verklärungsszene (17,1-8) die Überlegenheit Jesu gegenüber Mose herauszustellen. Völlig beiseite bleiben muß 23,2.8-10, denn hier geht es nicht um die Aberkennung des traditionellen Titels des Mose als Lehrer Israels, sondern um die Infragestellung zeitgenössischer Autoritäten (253). Analoges gilt für 24,3. Unsicherheit bekennt der Verf. gegenüber der Einzugsszene (21,1-17). Die Möglichkeit, daß Jesus hier als Profet und König wie Mose gezeichnet werden soll, legt sich zwar vom weiteren Kontext her nahe, wird jedoch in der Perikope selbst nicht expliziert. Zuversichtlicher ist das Urteil hinsichtlich 14,13-21; 15,29-39. Denn obwohl die beiden Brotvermehrungsszenen selbst stärkere Bezüge auf die Elischa-Geschichte als auf das Mannawunder aufweisen, ergibt sich aus der engen thematischen Verbindung mit 26,17-30 ein indirekter Bezug auf die Mose-Thematik. Dort nämlich, in der Mahlszene, will der Verf. eine typologische Verbindung mit Ex 24,8 festmachen: Wie Mose durch Blut zum Mittler des alten Bundes wurde, so wird Jesus durch Blut zum Mittler des neuen (258). Die Schwierigkeit dieser Deutung besteht freilich, wie der Verf. selbst erkennt, darin, daß Ex 24,8 gerade nicht, wie Mt 26,28, von *Sündenvergebung durch Blut* spricht. Der Versuch, sie durch Hinweise auf die Targume Onkelos und Pseudo-Jonathan sowie auf Hebr 9,15-22 zu beheben (258-261), läßt zumindest Fragen offen. Für die Schlußszene 28,16-20 legt sich aufgrund der Gattungsmerkmale ein typologischer Bezug auf die Beauftragungen der Nachfolger des Gesetzesgebers Mose (Dtn 31,14-15.23; Jos 1,1-9) immerhin nahe, auch wenn dieser in Ermangelung expliziter Textsignale hypothetisch bleiben muß (262-266).

Bei der Zusammenfassung seiner Ergebnisse übt der Verf. eine fast übergroße Zurückhaltung: Das Thema des "neuen Mose" sei bei Mt lediglich ein Thema unter anderen und keineswegs das wichtigste. "The Moses typology is no more the trunk of Matthew's Christology than it is only a distal twig. It is somewhere in between: I should liken it to a main branch" (268).

Was aber trägt diese Typologie im Rahmen der Theologie des Mt aus? Was die *Christologie* betrifft, so dient sie dazu, die Autorität Jesu zu unterstreichen — und zwar nicht nur einseitig als die des Gesetzgebers. Dabei geht es, anders als bei Paulus oder Johannes, nicht um Gegensatz, sondern um Überbietung. Die Rückbindung Jesu an Mose bedeutete ferner eine Vereinigung der Christen mit der geheiligten Vergangenheit der Juden und damit eine Stärkung ihrer *Gruppenidentität* (278). *Apologetik* gegenüber Juden spielt am Rande mit hinein. Als weitere Gesichtspunkte werden genannt: *literarische Konvention*, auf Ganzheitlichkeit drängendes *Weltverständnis* und der Gedanke der bleibenden *Gegenwart der Vergangenheit*.

Alle diese Beobachtungen treffen zweifellos Richtiges. Und doch stehen sie recht beziehungslos nebeneinander. Ich habe den Eindruck, daß ihnen ein integrierendes Zentrum fehlt, und eben an diesem Punkt setzen meine kritischen Rückfragen ein. Müßte man nicht in einem sehr viel stärkeren Maße, als es hier geschieht, dem Bezug zwischen Typologie und Geschichtsverständnis nachgehen? Dieser Aspekt wird zwar kurz zur Sprache gebracht in dem Hinweis darauf, daß die matthäische Typologie die Antithese zum Marcionitismus mit dessen Dichotomie zwischen dem Gott Israels und dem Gott Jesu Christi sei: "Jesus brought to fulfillment the history of Israel" (274). Es bleibt dies jedoch ein Aspekt unter vielen anderen. Er hätte m.E. unbedingt eine Vertiefung verdient. Die leidenschaftliche Diskussion um Wesen und theologische Bedeutung von Typologie, zu der R. Bultmann, G. von Rad, L. Goppelt und U. Luz (um nur einige Namen zu nennen) wichtige Beiträge geliefert haben, hat zu dem Ergebnis geführt, daß Typologie zu allererst eine Weise theologischer Geschichtsdeutung ist, die Personen und Ereignisse der Geschichte Gottes mit Israel in der Vergangenheit mit Personen und Ereignissen dieser Geschichte in der Endzeit in Bezug setzt, wobei die grundlegende Einheit des geschichtlichen Handelns Gottes die Voraussetzung bildet. Diese Geschichtsdeutung vollzieht sich zwar in Texten und sie bedient sich dabei notwendig literarischer und sprachlicher Mittel, aber ihre Gegenstände sind nicht überlieferte Texte, sondern Personen und Ereignisse der Vergangenheit. Der Verf. hat diese ganze Diskussion samt ihren Ergebnissen offenbar bewußt und konsequent beiseite gelassen, wie schon das Fehlen der entsprechenden Titel in seiner Bibliographie zeigt (besonders auffällig ist das Fehlen des grundlegenden Artikels τύπος κτλ. von L. Goppelt in ThWNT VIII 246-260). Er hat sich damit von Vorgaben freigehalten, die ihn bei seinem Vorhaben einer rein historisch-literarischen Untersuchung hätten behindern können. Wie schon zu Anfang festgestellt, war die so gewonnene Unbefangenheit nicht ohne Gewinn. Sie erbrachte eine Fülle von beachtlichen Beobachtungen und Ergebnissen, auf die in Zukunft jeder Ausleger des MtEv dankbar zurückgreifen wird. Aber das ist erkaufte mit einer nicht unerheblichen Unschärfe der Konturen. Weil die Frage nach der theologischen Struktur von Typologie — und das heißt konkret: die Frage nach dem heilsgeschichtlichen Denkansatz des Mt und seiner Ausprägung in den jeweiligen Texten — nicht konsequent genug gestellt wird, fällt ein unerläßliches Kriterium für die Feststellung und Beurteilung von Typologien aus. Zitate und Anspielungen auf biblische Texte, Aufnahmen traditionsgeschichtlicher Motive, Metaphern und Allegorien werden zwar aufgewiesen und analysiert, um dann jedoch allzu schnell und ohne zureichende Begründung unter den Oberbegriff der Typologie verrechnet zu werden. Kurz: in dem Versuch, Typologie einseitig als literarisches Phänomen zu behandeln, scheint mir die Schwäche dieses wichtigen und verdienstvollen Buches zu liegen.

Falkenstrasse 38
D-91056 Erlangen

Jürgen ROLOFF

Bruce CHILTON, *A Feast of Meanings*. Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles (NTS 72). Leiden, Brill, 1994. XI+210 p. 16 × 25

Bruce Chilton, Bernard Iddings Bell Professor of Religion at Bard College, New York, studies the Eucharist by an analytical approach which he calls "generative exegesis"; thus, he intends to identify the meaning of eucharist at given stages of its development because social groups assign productive meanings to common actions. Chilton views this generative exegesis as preferable to starting from the actual eucharistic texts backwards because the latter method carries the archaeological fallacy, he says, that one can peel off layers to arrive at the original meaning of the Eucharist, like excavating tells to discover strata. Chilton claims he can identify six major stages of development in eucharistic practices which trace with unusual clarity the emergence of Christianity from Judaism and that these stages alone enable us to speak of the meaning of the Eucharist.

Since the study, though interesting, is highly conjectural, it is not likely that many scholars will find Chilton's analytic approach of generative exegesis of the Eucharist persuasive. However, given the importance of the topic for mainline Protestants, Orthodox Christians and Catholics, Chilton's proposed six stages need to be evaluated. I leave to more competent scholars the evaluation of his interpretation of Rabbinic Judaism in the time of Jesus and so address myself to the application of his findings to the New Testament data. I will first present each stage and then offer an evaluation of it.

It is a given that all scholars grant that there are significant differences of wording, emphasis, timing and contexts in the eucharistic texts of the Synoptic Gospels, Paul, John, and the *Didache*. According to Chilton, the first two stages of his proposed development reflect practices of Jesus neither of which is now discoverable in the biblical texts. Jesus in the first stage encouraged fellowship meals in anticipation of God's kingdom, and the issue of boundaries and purity were also a programmatic concern at these meals. Chilton's admission that the first two stages cannot be discovered in the biblical texts underlines the conjectural nature of his assertions. Jesus' fellowship meals originally were not eucharistic; that aspect was later read back into these scenes. These meals involved purity, but as a secondary aspect, justified by more important ones. These were: being faithful to what God actually wanted, being open to Jesus and his message about the kingdom, fellowship and forgiveness of sins. According to Chilton, the second stage of eucharistic development occurred when Jesus during the last days occupied the temple and insisted that his views on purity be accepted. When the temple authority rejected this, a major shift in the nature of Jesus' meals with his disciples took place. Jesus boldly proclaimed the wine and the bread of his fellowship meals as a surrogate for sacrifice offered in the temple and as more acceptable. To point to this desired purity Jesus began to refer to what he offered at these meals as "this is my blood" and "this is my body". This last sentence demonstrates that Chilton himself realizes that he has too quickly dismissed

the Last Supper as, “a function of the ritual dramatization which characterizes the Gospels” (64; cf. 43-44), for he must now explain away the wording which many accept as genuine. Chilton contends that Jesus’ application of these words to himself was a development of the later Johannine tradition, but would it have been tolerated at any stage were it not true? The very uniqueness of such statements is the strongest argument in favor of their being genuine. To make his case Chilton must move “blood” prior to the “bread” to correspond to the Temple sacrifice; naturally, he looks to Luke 22,17-18 to substantiate such an interpretation, but these verses are more easily explained by the presence of more than one cup of wine at some Jewish meals. Moreover, other than at the Last Supper, there is no evidence in the Gospels of a major shift in the nature of Jesus’ meals nor did he “occupy” the temple. Rather he only once acted like an OT prophet in driving out those trafficking in the temple, in overturning their tables and in preventing anyone from carrying anything through the temple. Surely, he continued to teach there, but each evening he went outside the city (Mark 11,15-19; parr.). Nor can Jesus’ cleansing of the temple be easily connected with his fellowship meals.

For Chilton the third stage of development comes from Petrine Christianity when a principal model for a new understanding of the eucharist became the *berākā* of Judaism, the blessing or breaking of bread at home. More profoundly, this group conceived of Jesus as a new Moses who likewise gave commands about purity and expected his followers to worship on Mount Zion. Thus, they congregated in one another’s homes and again recognized the validity of sacrifice in the Temple. The third stage reveals another weakness of Chilton’s first two stages, for he now has to return to the *berākā* and the validity of temple sacrifice, whereas our present eucharistic texts suggest the *berākā* as the original background of the meal and only later theological reflection on the Eucharist challenges the validity of the temple sacrifice. Furthermore, Chilton himself states, “The absence of direct evidence of how the group around Peter emerged is daunting” (75); yet he proceeds to say that the Transfiguration, with Peter as its major witness, is the key to understanding this circle. He points to the parallels between Moses and elements of Exod 24 and the Transfiguration, but in no way does he show that it is Peter who is the source of the Synoptics’ Transfiguration Story nor that the Synoptic eucharistic texts depend on that story, even though they speak of τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης (Mark 14,24; Matt 26,28; cf. Luke 22,20; Exod 24,8). Has Chilton forgotten his own warning about the archaeological fallacy that texts conceal meanings in the way that tells cover artifacts or has he come to realize that perhaps it is not entirely a fallacy?

The Jacobean circle created the fourth type of eucharist which becomes the Seder, in terms of both its meaning and chronology. Thus, the Jesus movement became fully integrated within the liturgical institutions of Judaism; and Jerusalem, its governing center. Only Jews in a state of purity could participate in the eucharist which was celebrated only once a year, at Passover, in Jerusalem. To be sure the NT authors view the Eucharist as a Seder, but the more probably source for this was Jesus himself. If one does

not, as Chilton, summarily dismiss the event of the Last Supper, a more reasonable assumption is that, even though because of conflicting NT evidence we cannot determine whether Jesus actually celebrated the Passover or not, at a minimum the meal was celebrated in a Passover atmosphere because of the very nearness of the feast. Nor should we deny to Jesus the kinds of reflections that any pious Jew at that time of the liturgical year would have had. James represented the most conservative branch of Christianity but probably had little influence outside of Jerusalem. The limitations placed on the Gentiles in Acts 15,20.29 (cf. 16,4) are not to be found in Gal 2,1-10; and once Jesus himself is seen as the probable source for designating the Last Supper as a Passover, Chilton has no real connecting factor between the Eucharist and James.

The fifth type of eucharist proposed is represented by Paul and the Synoptics. According to Chilton, Paul insists that Jesus' last meal occurred on the night he was betrayed, emphasizes the link with Jesus' death and accepts a Hellenistic refinement of the Petrine eucharist as a sacrifice for sins. The Synoptic Gospels embrace Paul's eucharist which for them becomes a meal of solidarity with the heroic martyr, Jesus, a *ḥaṭṭāt*, a sacrifice which creates or recreates a sacred environment once polluted. Instead of directly opposing the Jacobean program, the Synoptics' various wordings stress that Jesus' blood is shed in the interests of the communities; and they provide two stories of miraculous feeding which symbolized the inclusion of Jews and non-Jews within the eucharist, viewed as a philosophical symposium. Again, in response to Chilton, there is no reason to deny that Jesus was aware of his forthcoming death and saw it as part of God's eschatological salvation. The healing of the paralytic (Mark 2,1-11; parr.) and the story of the sinful woman forgiven (Luke 7,47-49; cf. 24,47) associate the forgiveness of sins with the earthly Jesus. Why this theme could not be original to the last meal of Jesus is not at all clear. Once one grants the original Passover dimension of Jesus' Last Supper, there is little need to predicate the minimalist supposition of a *ḥaṭṭāt*, since the former meal not only commemorates the salvific event of the exodus but looks to all of Israel, a designation of the church which with time will also embrace the Gentiles. Moreover, before resorting to the *ḥaṭṭāt*, the NT data would suggest the messianic banquet because Jesus was considered the Christ. Any description of the Last Supper in terms of a philosophical symposium would definitely be later and limited in nature since Jesus was a Jew and Jewish meals suffice to explain the original event.

Chilton presents the sixth type of eucharist as a consciously non-Judaic and Hellenistic development. John takes up the feeding of the 5,000, understood as occurring at Passover, in a fully paschal sense and construes the eucharist as a mystery. Jesus himself is more identified with the *manna* (cf. 1 Cor 5,7-8), miraculous food bestowed by God upon his people, and offers his own flesh and blood, although crude misunderstandings are avoided. The Book of Revelation develops this break with Judaism and identifies Jesus himself (rather than his supper) as the paschal lamb. What Chilton refuses to see and the acceptance of which would destroy his whole theoretical reconstruction is that John is simply developing the original

eucharistic tradition, eaten in a Passover atmosphere during which Jesus identified himself with the bread and with the wine in the cup. So, the mystery started with the original event. However, the lamb and *manna* do flow from theological reflections on the Eucharist as Passover. In a sense, there is a break with Judaism; but the Jewish sect which breaks away sees itself as more loyal to Jewish traditions, hopes and promises and primarily used Jewish categories to describe its greatest mystery.

Chilton's book raises several exegetical and hermeneutical questions. Really, he is asking what happened (147); but how reliable is the historical method, in its present state of development, in addressing certain problematic texts? At times, even though an author makes every effort to reason as carefully as possible, are we not confronted with a series of conjectures from which no solid academic conclusions can really flow? What criteria demonstrate that a scholar is productively employing historical methodology? Yet an hermeneutical question remains. One of the conclusions that Chilton draws from his investigation is, "The sense with which a practice is mediated to a community is therefore one measure of what that community will finally produce as its practice, but the initial meaning does not determine the final meaning" (158; cf. 157). This statement is suspiciously in his case hypothesis, not conclusion; it verges on relativity and reinforces Chilton's earlier position that Jesus did not found the Eucharist, at least, as presently portrayed in our NT eucharistic texts and a given community practice can determine its meaning. Who is correct and so speaks with authority and merits our agreement? Theoretically, these questions should never arise, for truth is one; yet in some recent historical investigations the interpretative authority of the NT authors is not infrequently being called into question. A scholar needs to be in touch with his stance toward the NT authors, if for no other reasons than to know, for the sake of clarity, what brand of christianity he represents.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

R. F. O'TOOLE, S.J.

Julián CARRÓN PEREZ, *Jesús, el Mesías manifestado*. Tradición literaria y trasfondo judío de Hch 3,19-26 (Studia Semitica Novi Testamenti 2). Madrid, Editorial Ciudad Nueva-Fundación San Justino, 1993. 361 p. 16,5 × 24

Il testo, che riproduce una tesi dottorale difesa presso la Facultad de Teología del Norte de España in Burgos, colloca anzitutto il tema nel dibattito sui discorsi missionari degli Atti (35-40). Rifacendosi ai criteri proposti da M. Wilcox, l'A. pensa che in At 3,19-26 si abbia un materiale tradizionale, proveniente dalla comunità cristiana di lingua aramaica.

All'esposizione delle anomalie e aporie del testo e ai tentativi di soluzione proposti è dedicato il primo capitolo del libro (41-81). L'elencazione dei problemi segue per l'essenziale il commentario di Bauernfeind del 1939,

mentre le principali soluzioni finora proposte (O. Bauernfeind, U. Wilckens, G. Lohfink, A. Barbi, W.S. Kurz) vengono giudicate insufficienti. Il loro limite, per l'A., starebbe in un presupposto non dimostrato: che At 3,19-26 parli della parusia del Signore. Soprattutto, resterebbe da dimostrare che At 3,20 parli di una permanenza di Gesù in cielo successiva all'incarnazione e anteriore alla venuta finale.

Un esame analitico del testo copre i cap. 2-7 del libro (82-304). Ci dispensiamo dal riassumere l'articolata analisi che viene fatta dei singoli versetti del testo, poiché i motivi essenziali dell'argomentazione si ritrovano nella conclusione del libro. Essa fa seguito al cap. 8 (305-325), in cui si puntualizzano le scelte interpretative in contrapposizione con gli studi recenti di Barbi, Robinson, Hahn, Longenecker, Moule e Lohfink.

Nella conclusione (327-337) i risultati dell'analisi sono ripresi in forma sistematica. Secondo il nostro A. le anomalie del testo scompaiono se i vv. 20-21 vengono riferiti alla prima venuta di Gesù e non alla permanenza di Gesù in cielo prima della sua seconda venuta nella parusia: la motivazione della conversione torna allora ad essere quella comune in Atti, cioè la risurrezione e non la parusia; il verbo *apostéllō* recupera il significato abituale nel N.T. correlato alla prima venuta di Gesù; spariscono le tensioni temporali, in quanto i vv. 16-19, 20-21 e 22-26 farebbero riferimento allo stesso momento cronologico, quello iniziato con la venuta storica di Gesù e che continua mentre Pietro parla; sarebbero questi infine i tempi salvifici già compiuti con la venuta di Gesù e che vengono designati come *chrónoi apokatastaseōs*. Questa lettura diventa possibile secondo l'A. grazie all'interpretazione causale e non finale di *hópōs án*, attribuendo l'equivoco ad una errata interpretazione della particella aramaica *dī* presente nel materiale tradizionale.

Che si debba pensare all'esistenza di un sostrato aramaico lo mostrebbero i diversi semitismi che si segnalano nel testo. Il fatto che alcuni di questi semitismi siano veri e propri aramaismi, impedirebbe di risolverli tutti nella cosiddetta «imitazione della LXX». Tutto ciò induce l'A. a pensare ad una fonte aramaica, giunta a Luca già tradotta in un greco assai rozzo. Nei discorsi degli Atti si incontrano aramaismi, uso giudaico della Scrittura, argomentazioni scritturistiche pertinenti solo di fronte ad un uditorio giudaico, applicazione a Gesù della promessa fatta alla discendenza di Abramo, uso del titolo di «servo», somiglianze letterarie e contenutistiche con il Benedictus e il Magnificat: tutto questo è possibile per l'A. solo in ambienti giudeo-cristiani, contraddice l'opinione comune che vede nei discorsi l'opera letteraria di Luca e rilancia l'ipotesi, già di Wilcox, dell'esistenza del materiale dei discorsi previamente al suo inserimento negli Atti.

Il testo di Carrón si presenta come uno studio accurato della pericope e mostra il possesso da parte dell'A. di una buona padronanza delle problematiche dell'opera lucana e nel contempo del contesto letterario e teologico palestinese dei primordi del cristianesimo. Tra i risultati che ci sentiamo di condividere va annoverata questa maggiore attenzione alle radici semitiche e specificamente aramaiche delle origini cristiane, che non mancava però anche negli studi di Lohfink e di Barbi pur rivolti alla dimensione redazio-

nale. In specie ci sembra interessante il richiamo che viene fatto al legame con il Benedictus e indirettamente con il Magnificat.

Queste parziali convergenze non giungono però a farci condividere l'assunto globale dell'opera, secondo cui At 3,19-26 andrebbe visto come una cattiva traduzione di un testo aramaico, su cui Luca non avrebbe operato alcun adattamento. Troppi sono infatti gli interrogativi che scaturiscono dalla valutazione dell'analisi e che qui possiamo richiamare solo in parte.

Iniziamo con il chiederci se sia giusto voler spiegare tutto con il ricorso ad un sostrato aramaico, rifiutando aprioristicamente il ricorso ad ipotesi come quella dei «settuagintismi» e in genere ad ogni spiegazione di tipo redazionale. Ad esempio, l'uso della paratassi nel v. 20 rimanda ad una fonte aramaica (99-103) o non va invece attribuito alla difficoltà di cucire insieme il v. 20a proveniente dalla tradizione con il v. 20b di carattere redazionale?

Un punto cruciale è l'interpretazione causale di *hópôs án* in quanto traduzione di un aramaico *dī*, che può avere appunto valore finale o causale (115-129). Ma questa interpretazione si appoggia su un solo caso parallelo, Dan 3,28, dove essa per di più non è affatto necessaria ma soltanto possibile. Per il resto gli altri esempi portati si riferiscono alla preposizione *hína*, mentre tutti i casi di intercambiabilità tra quest'ultima e *hópôs án* presentano una valenza finale e non causale.

Si può anche condividere che l'espressione «ultimi giorni» non comporti necessariamente un'allusione alla parusia, come vuole il nostro A. seguendo J. Carmignac (156). Resta però da vedere che cosa ciò significhi per un testo come quello del v. 21 dove non si parla di *eschátai hémérai*, bensì di *chrónoi apokatástaseôs*, un'espressione a cui è ben più difficile negare un riferimento escatologico.

L'interpretazione che vuole ricollegare *apokatástasis* al tema del compimento delle profezie ha una sua rigosità (162-167). Meraviglia però che manchi ogni riferimento ad At 1,6, in cui il tema viene introdotto per la prima volta nel libro e dove è chiaro che l'idea del compimento delle profezie è congiunta con quella del ristabilimento del Regno. Non sarebbe più logico pensare che la domanda posta in At 1,6, a cui in quel contesto non viene data una risposta diretta rimandando invece alla funzione della testimonianza, venga ripresa dall'autore degli Atti proprio in un contesto di esercizio della funzione testimoniale, cioè il discorso di Pietro in At 3, per affermare che il tempo dell'*apokatástasis* è quello della parusia?

Risolvere il problema costituito dalla presenza del verbo *deí* affermando che esso è il frutto di una errata traduzione e che andrebbe sostituito con *edeí* è per lo meno sospetto (167-172). Siamo di fronte ad un altro punto fondamentale dell'argomentazione del nostro A. e ancora una volta si ricorre ad un fraintendimento dell'originale. Ma se anche il traduttore del testo aramaico fosse incorso nell'errore di scambiare un passato per un presente, come si spiega che pure Luca rimanga cieco di fronte alla difficoltà di un verbo che resta orientato verso la parusia mentre tutto il resto del versetto sarebbe invece proiettato verso il Gesù terreno?

Un altro caso di evidente difficoltà nell'argomentazione dell'A. si ritrova nelle pagine dedicate a giustificare l'interpretazione di *anistēmi* al v. 22

nel senso di «suscitare» e quindi di «inviare» (208-223). Come si fa a dire che se in At 13,23 in qualche manoscritto il verbo *ágô* è sostituito da *egeirô* allora i due verbi sono in ogni caso intercambiabili? Non tutti i contesti sono uguali e i paralleli tratti dal libro dei Giudici e dal Benedictus potranno illuminare il senso di *egeirô* in At 13 ma non necessariamente quello di *anistêmi* in At 3. Quanto all'uso di Dt 18,15 in At 7,37 proprio il confronto con At 3,22.26 svela come sia il contesto di quest'ultimo passo a determinare in esso il senso risurrezionale di *anistêmi*. Sembra che l'A. non abbia chiaro come non sia il testo del Dt a prospettare o meno una interpretazione in senso risurrezionale del verbo, ma i contesti nei quali di volta in volta esso viene collocato.

Giustamente l'A. afferma che fonti giudaiche e vangeli mostrano come «l'attesa di un profeta escatologico prese due forme fondamentali: il ritorno di Elia e la speranza di un profeta come Mosè» (216-217). Ma proprio la prima forma andava approfondita, alla luce del fatto che Luca non identifica Elia con il Battista, come fanno Marco e Matteo. Si sarebbe così scoperto il legame del nostro testo con Mal 3,23-24 e quindi anche il senso dell'uso poi del verbo *apostêllô* in un contesto escatologico.

È rivelativo che l'A. affermi che «il v. 24 non aggiunge nulla di nuovo nell'argomentazione dell'oratore» (235): questo significa non percepire il significato della presenza di *kataggêllô*, tipico altrove per indicare la predicazione apostolica e qui riferito invece alle profezie; significa non percepire che «questi giorni» non possono essere che il tempo dell'annuncio apostolico, quelli in cui accade appunto il parlare e l'ascoltare di cui alla precedente citazione del Dt. Non si può legare l'interpretazione di «questi giorni» di At 3,24 con At 2,17.18: «quei» giorni «ultimi» della profezia di Gioele si compiono ora in «questi» giorni pentecostali.

L'argomentazione sul significato di *tás hêméras taútas* (253-260) è condotta in modo sconcertante: che ci possa essere un tempo presente viene sistematicamente ignorato, come se la contrapposizione tra i vv. 20-21 e il v. 26 vada risolta soltanto nella scelta tra il futuro, quello escatologico, e il passato, quello della vicenda storica di Gesù. Questo significa rifiutare di distinguere tra i tempi post-pasquali della predicazione apostolica e i tempi del Gesù pre-pasquale. Non si tratta di anticipare problematiche moderne, ma di rispettare senso e articolazione della storia della salvezza nella prospettiva lucana, così come emerge dalle parole del Risorto nel finale di Lc 24 e agli inizi di At 1.

Altrettanta perplessità lasciano le considerazioni finali del cap. 6 (274-278), dove sembra di essere di fronte ad un circolo vizioso tra provenienza della citazione veterotestamentaria da circoli giudeo-cristiani e applicazione della benedizione abramitica in essa contenuta ai giudei e non ai gentili. C'è da chiedersi piuttosto se è poi tanto sicuro che la benedizione abramitica in At 3,25 sia riservata ai soli giudei: l'uso di *patriai* nella citazione di Gen 22,18 in luogo di *éthnê* serve evidentemente ad includere Israele nel gruppo di tutti i popoli, non certo a riferire solo ad esso la benedizione con esclusione degli altri popoli.

Il nostro A. è fortemente preoccupato di difendere l'uso «normale» nel N.T. di *apostêllô*, negando pertanto che esso possa far riferimento non

solo alla venuta storica di Cristo, ma anche alla sua venuta nella parusia e a quella nella predicazione (281-287). Ci si potrebbe chiedere perché non assuma lo stesso atteggiamento nei riguardi dell'uso di *anistêmi*, dove egli si trova costretto a proporre quel significato di «suscitare» che costituirebbe l'unico caso neotestamentario di applicazione di questo verbo a Gesù senza riferimento alla risurrezione.

Ci sarebbe anche da chiedersi come mai non si accetti che *apostêllô* significhi prima l'invio parusiaco e poi quello post-risurrezionale nell'annuncio, quando invece si accetta uno slittamento di senso per *epistrêphô* – *apostêphô*. Ma è proprio questo, invece, il messaggio di Luca nel nostro testo: che gli invii sono due; che non occorre attendere la fine dei tempi per rientrare nella salvezza; che colui che deve venire è già ora attivo e presente nei suoi inviati!

È chiaro che parlare del primo invio di Gesù non significa escludere da esso il momento della morte e della risurrezione. L'A. ne è esplicitamente consapevole (287). E sarebbe ben strano che non lo fosse, atteso il carattere kerygmatico del testo, a cui quindi non può sfuggire la centralità dell'evento pasquale. Ma con altrettanta chiarezza va pure detto che affermare che il testo ha come oggetto l'invio del Risorto nella predicazione dei suoi testimoni (At 3,15) non significa prescindere dalla storia di Gesù, che di questa predicazione è l'oggetto e ovviamente dagli eventi pasquali che ne sono il centro.

Il quadro globale che il nostro A. propone non appare convincente. Lascia perplessa una costruzione che si affida essenzialmente a fraintendimenti di un originale aramaico. Lascia perplesso l'oscillare della dimostrazione che parte dal presupposto di un originale aramaico, per poi scivolare verso un testo già tradotto in greco, che Luca avrebbe semplicemente trascritto. C'è da chiedersi come mai un testo che secondo il nostro A. parla del Gesù terreno debba ricorrere ad un linguaggio largamente tributario del linguaggio apocalittico. E se il legame con il mondo della letteratura apocalittica è difficilmente contestabile, come pensare allora che i contenuti che il testo esprime possano essere privati di ogni valenza escatologica? Diffidare dei pregiudizi teologici ci sembra un saggio avvertimento (189), ma altrettanto facili da proporre e difficili da provare sono i ricorsi ai sostrati aramaici.

Non si vuole negare che dietro gli attuali testi, anche quelli degli Atti, ci sia una tradizione viva. Ma non si può neanche accettare per principio che i redattori siano semplici trascrittori di questo materiale, senza capacità di inserirlo in una specifica e propria prospettiva teologica. Che Luca utilizzi una formula non lucana di invio, come accade nel v. 20 e nel v. 26, non significa che egli si impedisca di integrarla nella propria teologia e quindi si costringa a riferirla soltanto alla prima venuta di Gesù nella storia.

Il limite radicale che impedisce all'A. di scorgere una soluzione plausibile dei problemi che egli stesso pone, sta nell'aver distaccato l'analisi del discorso dal suo contesto e cioè dal legame con il miracolo dello storpio (At 3,1-11), in specie dalla presenza operante del nome di Gesù che in quella guarigione si rivela (At 3,16). La funzione del discorso è invece strettamente correlata all'evento che lo precede: esso vuole spiegare come Colui che at-

tualmente è in cielo ed è atteso alla fine dei tempi sia operante oggi nella storia. Il discorso risponde a questa domanda e afferma che questo avviene nella predicazione e nell'azione degli apostoli. Lo sguardo non è rivolto al passato ma al presente. Sembra quasi che il timore di veder compromessa la fondazione storica della cristologia abbia condotto l'A. a svuotare di ogni significato salvifico il progetto ecclesiologico lucano.

E qui si giunge all'interrogativo essenziale, quello che emerge nella conclusione dell'opera, là dove l'A. dichiara che la sua analisi di At 3,19-26 rappresenta un contributo per avvalorare la teoria che i discorsi lucani sono materiale «della prima ora» (334), testi tradizionali antichi, sebbene «più difficile è stabilire se la predicazione che essi contengono corrisponde a ciò che gli oratori dissero realmente nelle diverse circostanze» (ivi). Se poi si prende atto che la loro teologia non contrasta con quella del resto del libro, allora occorre concludere, secondo il nostro A., che non esiste una teologia lucana, ma Luca ha semplicemente aderito e riproposto nel resto della sua opera la teologia della tradizione: «Il fatto che in un testo certamente tradizionale appaia la cosiddetta teologia lucana non è una ragione sufficiente per pensare che Luca non creò la sua teologia, ma che la ricevette nei materiali di cui si servì per comporre la sua opera e poi la estese alle parti che scrisse egli stesso?» (336). Come tutto questo si concili con la presenza di un terzo vangelo con caratteristiche ben peculiari rispetto a quelle degli altri sinottici resta un mistero; a meno che, volendo distruggere il «mito» della teologia lucana, non si voglia pagare il prezzo di un «tradimento» da parte di Marco e di Matteo nei confronti della tradizione, visto che la loro prospettiva teologica non è certo assimilabile a quella di Lc-At.

Il libro si schiera con la tendenza oggi diffusa di retrodatare i testi neo-testamentari — o almeno le fonti che essi avrebbero pedissequamente trascritte —, così da annullare la funzione della tradizione delle parole e degli eventi cristici e proto-ecclesiali, nella convinzione che solo così si possa salvare la fede dagli attacchi della storia. Il risultato di tentativi di questo genere è di costruire fragili castelli storici, distruggendo per contropartita la funzione stessa della comunità ecclesiale, cioè quel suo ruolo di mediatrice della presenza vivente e operante di Cristo risorto, che proprio At 3,19-26 vuole con forza proclamare.

V. Mesastris, 1
I-06034 Foligno (Perugia)

Giuseppe BETORI

George H. GUTHRIE, *The Structure of Hebrews. A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (NTS 73). Leiden - New York - Köln, E.J. Brill, 1994. XIX-161 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 100,00; \$57.25

Admirablement imprimé et comprenant une grande variété de schémas et de graphiques, ce volume sur la structure de l'épître aux Hébreux se divise en deux parties. La première, plus courte (1-41), présente l'histoire de la recherche sur le sujet et une appréciation des diverses approches utilisées.

La seconde, plus importante (43-147), propose une approche nouvelle et les conclusions auxquelles celle-ci aboutit. Une abondante bibliographie, un index des auteurs cités et un index des sujets traités complètent le volume.

Il n'y a pas lieu de s'attarder ici sur la première partie. L'«agnosticisme structurel» de J. Moffatt ou de T.C.G. Thornton y est critiqué avec raison (24-26). Des observations judicieuses y sont faites également sur la tendance actuelle à faire entrer de force l'épître aux Hébreux et d'autres écrits du N.T. dans les cadres de la rhétorique grecque, comme si la prédication chrétienne ne constituait pas un genre nouveau (32-33).

La seconde partie de l'ouvrage promet de faire avancer la recherche en utilisant une «analyse de linguistique textuelle» appelée aussi «analyse de discours». Ces expressions très vagues sont définies p.36-37 et 46 comme désignant une façon d'examiner les textes qui «cherche à comprendre les relations entre les diverses sections du discours d'un auteur». À plusieurs reprises, G.H.G. avertit le lecteur que sa méthode sera «highly eclectic» (xviii et 45), ce qui ne peut manquer de provoquer quelque inquiétude. Sa recherche porte d'abord sur les ruptures de cohésion («cohesion shifts») observables dans le texte; elles peuvent manifester le passage d'une unité littéraire à une autre. Sont ensuite examinées les inclusions, qui marquent le début et la fin d'une même unité. L'attention se porte enfin sur les éléments qui assurent la cohésion entre toutes les unités du discours ou la transition entre deux d'entre elles. Un dernier chapitre présente les conclusions que G.H.G. croit pouvoir tirer des observations effectuées. Il traite d'abord séparément les unités de genre explicatif et celles de genre exhortatif. Les premières sont groupées en deux parties, d'extension très inégale (fig. 28, 117): «I. La position du Fils par rapport aux anges (1:5-2:18)»; «II. La position du Fils, notre grand prêtre, par rapport au système sacrificiel terrestre (4:14-10:25)». On notera que He 3,1-6 n'entre pas dans ce schéma, bien que ce passage expose un point de doctrine: «Jésus, qui est digne de foi [...] comme Moïse» (He 3,1-2). Il est vrai que cet exposé est introduit par un impératif: «considérez». Mais si une introduction de ce genre suffit à faire classer tout le passage comme exhortatif, alors il faut aussi mettre He 7,4-10 dans les exhortations, car ce texte commence par un impératif semblable: «contemplez». On remarquera d'autre part qu'inconséquent avec lui-même, G.H.G. place dans cette série d'exposés deux passages exhortatifs: He 4,14-16 et 10,19-25. Pour les unités exhortatives, une disposition chiasique est adoptée, autour de He 6,4-8 comme élément central (fig. 31, 136). Une structure d'ensemble est enfin proposée (fig. 35, 144). Disposée en deux colonnes, elle reflète la séparation précédente, sauf qu'elle étend à quelques sections explicatives le chiasme des sections exhortatives.

Dans ses réflexions finales, G.H.G. se montre conscient du caractère problématique de la structure qu'il propose (146). Il note, en particulier, un fait étrange: le grand exposé de christologie sacerdotale qui, selon cette structure, commence en 4,14, est brusquement interrompu, après quelques versets, par une longue exhortation (5,11-6,20). Effectivement, cette anomalie aurait dû provoquer un nouvel examen de l'ensemble des données et, en fin de compte, l'abandon de la structure proposée, celle-ci attribuant à un grand orateur une maladresse qu'on ne pardonnerait pas à un débutant.

L'option qui nuit le plus à cet ouvrage me semble être celle d'avoir attribué une valeur d'*inclusio* aux contacts verbaux qui existent entre He 4,14-16 et 10,19-23 et ont été signalés par W. Nauck (cf. 18 et 79). G. H. G. va jusqu'à dire que ces contacts «représentent le cas le plus frappant d'*inclusio* dans le livret d'Hébreux» (79). Pour avancer pareille affirmation, il faut n'avoir qu'une notion assez vague de l'inclusion sémitique. Celle-ci consiste, on le sait, dans la répétition, à la fin d'une unité littéraire, d'une formule ou d'un mot employés au début de cette même unité. Ainsi sont indiquées les limites initiale et finale de l'unité. Pour qu'il soit possible de voir une inclusion entre He 4,14-16 et un passage de He 10, la première condition serait donc que le passage choisi fût une finale d'unité littéraire. Or il est clair que He 10,19 est un début d'unité, le début d'une importante exhortation (He 10,19-39), qui suit le grand exposé de He 7,1-10,18. Ce texte n'a donc aucun titre à constituer une finale d'inclusion. D'autre part, une inclusion ne consiste jamais en contacts verbaux dispersés sur un large espace et mêlés à d'autres contacts verbaux, comme c'est le cas dans le texte en question. En He 4,14 on a l'expression *echontes oun archierea megan*; pour reconstituer une expression semblable en He 10,19-21 (*echontes oun ... hierrea megan*), il faut sauter non moins de 27 mots entre *oun* et *hierrea*! D'autre part, en He 10,21 *hierrea megan* est précisé par la formule *epi ton oikon tou Theou*, qui fait allusion à He 3,6 *epi ton oikon autou*. Le qualificatif *pistos* de He 10,23 constitue un autre contact avec le même passage (He 3,1-6), car il s'y trouve deux fois (He 3,2.5) et jamais entre 3,5 et 10,23. En outre, He 10,22 forme antithèse avec l'exhortation qui commence en 3,7 et porte l'attention sur les «cœurs» (*kardia*: 3,8.10.12.15), mettant en garde contre «un cœur mauvais d'absence de foi» (3,12); en He 10,22, en effet, *kardia* est répété deux fois et *ponëra* se retrouve également; au «cœur mauvais d'absence de foi» la phrase de He 10,22 oppose un «cœur sincère en plénitude de foi». Cela étant, pourquoi faudrait-il privilégier les contacts verbaux de He 10,19-23 avec 4,14-16 en ignorant ceux qui existent avec 3,1-12? Et pourquoi encore le *dia tou katapetasmatos* de He 10,20 devrait-il être mis en relation avec le *dielëluthota tous ouranous* de 4,14, alors qu'il est strictement parallèle au *tou katapetasmatos* de He 6,19? Des rapports existent assurément entre He 10,19-23 et He 4,14-16, mais ils ne constituent nullement une inclusion et ils ne permettent pas de conclure que He 10,25 serait la fin d'une grande partie dont He 4,14 serait le début.

L'erreur commise sur ce point n'a pas permis à G. H. G. de reconnaître que la christologie sacerdotale de l'épître est exposée par l'auteur dans deux parties nettement distinctes (3,1-5,10 et 7,1-10,18), dont la première ne contient aucune polémique contre la Loi ou contre la première Alliance, qui n'y sont même pas nommées, tandis que la deuxième critique âprement l'une et l'autre (cf. He 7,12.18-19.28; 8,4-5.7-8.13; 9,9-10; 10,1-4.8-9). La longue exhortation de He 5,11-6,20 se situe exactement entre ces deux exposés et, loin d'être une digression mal venue, elle remplit deux fonctions structurelles, celle de bien marquer la distinction des deux exposés et celle de souligner l'importance du second (cf. He 5,11-6,3).

L'étude des «ruptures de cohésion» et celle des différents procédés de transition apportent un bon nombre d'observations intéressantes, mais au-

cune donnée décisive pour la structure. G. H. G. a d'ailleurs la sagesse de reconnaître que l'intensité des ruptures de cohésion n'est pas forcément significative. Un «median level cohesion shift» peut correspondre à une division du texte aussi importante qu'un «high level cohesion shift» (74). De fait, lorsqu'un auteur soigne ses transitions, — et c'est le cas dans notre épître —, la rupture de cohésion entre la dernière phrase d'une section et la première de la section suivante peut sembler presque inexistante. Dans d'autres cas, une rupture de cohésion peut se produire à l'intérieur d'une unité littéraire. Les analyses de G. H. G. à ce sujet sont en général bien conduites, mais quelques-unes suscitent la perplexité. Pourquoi, par exemple, voir en He 2,10 une importante rupture de cohésion (64), alors que ce verset continue les thèmes de la «gloire» et de la «souffrance», caractéristiques des versets précédents. On s'étonnera plus encore de la rupture indiquée entre He 4,2 et 4,3 (67); elle est inexistante, le commentaire du Ps 95 continuant jusqu'en 4,11.

Parlant des procédés de transition, G. H. G. en nomme certains «Distant Hook Words» (95-96). Cette appellation est une *contradictio in terminis*. Par définition, la transition par «mot-crochet» s'effectue au moyen de la répétition immédiate d'un même mot dans deux phrases successives. Si la répétition est distante, par ex. entre He 5,10 et 7,1 (98), il ne s'agit plus de «mot-crochet», ni d'ailleurs de transition, mais d'un autre genre de contact verbal. Dans le cas cité, le rapport principal s'établit entre He 5,10 et He 6,20 (plutôt que 7,1), car He 6,20 rappelle l'annonce de thème faite en 5,10. Ce thème est ensuite développé en He 7,1-28. Mais G. H. G. ne s'intéresse pas aux annonces de thèmes. C'est là un autre défaut majeur de son étude. Comment découvrir la structure d'un discours, si on ne recherche pas les passages dans lesquels l'auteur annonce les sujets qu'il veut traiter, passages que la rhétorique ancienne appelait *propositiones*? L'analyse de linguistique textuelle, telle que G. H. G. la pratique, manque de moyens pour établir une structure, car elle n'examine en définitive que les limites entre les unités littéraires, sans pouvoir déterminer leur organisation d'ensemble.

Dans cette étude «highly eclectic» d'autres points faibles seraient encore à signaler. D'autres mérites aussi, car elle met en œuvre des procédures d'investigation qui ouvrent des voies en partie nouvelles et elle aboutit sur plus d'un point à des observations intéressantes.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Albert VANHOYE, S.J.

Varia

Yves-Marie BLANCHARD, *Aux sources du canon, le témoignage d'Irénée* (Cogitatio fidei 175). Paris, les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 383 p. 13,5 × 21,5

La présente étude se range parmi les recherches actuelles qui souhaitent associer la témoignage de la Patristique à l'intelligence de la constitution du canon du Nouveau Testament ainsi que de la vie des premiers communau-

tés chrétiens. Il convient donc de souligner l'intérêt d'une telle perspective. Les apostoliques et apologistes, puis Irénée, sont ici interrogés sur l'état de la réception des Écritures à la fin du deuxième siècle. Les conclusions de l'auteur sont vraisemblables et raisonnables: Irénée semble montrer qu'à cette date les logia du Seigneur font encore l'objet d'une référence à une transmission d'ordre oral, attachée à une Parole sentie comme vivante dans une communauté, tandis que les œuvres littéraires sont en cours de canonisation. Du point de vue théologique, l'A. souligne, dans sa conclusion, que chez Irénée «la relation au Christ ne relève pas exclusivement de la référence scripturaire... le Christ est celui qui continue de parler, sans que les mots lui soient dictés par une quelconque norme textuelle; plus que l'objet d'une écriture, le Christ est d'abord le sujet d'une parole» (329).

Ces conclusions, pour justes qu'elles soient, sont-elles toujours suffisamment étayées? C'est le point faible de l'ouvrage. La documentation bibliographique est très largement insuffisante. Une étude aussi importante que celle de O. Skardaune, *The Proof from Prophecy. A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden 1987), sur les traditions qui semblent présider à la réception des Écritures chez Justin, n'est jamais évoquée. Trop souvent, l'A. se contente de renvoyer aux volumes de Sources chrétiennes dont les notes et les introductions, de qualité scientifique incostenable certes, ne permettent pas toujours (selon la date de parution des volumes) d'embrasser la problématique contemporaine. Plusieurs études, par exemple, ont été publiées sur les sources scripturaires d'Ignace d'Antioche. Y.-M. Blanchard ne cite ni H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (TU 65; Tübingen 1971), ni D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old Testament in Clement of Rome* (NTS 34; Leiden 1973), ni tant d'autres. Pour enthousiastes et sympathiques que soient les recherches de notre A., elles donnent l'impression d'une certaine naïveté dans le domaine qu'elles abordent.

La rapidité de quelques affirmations est dommageable. À la p. 21, la déclaration d'Ignace d'Antioche en Philad. 8,2 est dite résumer «assez bien l'attitude des premières générations chrétiennes à l'égard de ce que nous nommons aujourd'hui le Nouveau Testament». Malheureusement, l'interprétation de la phrase d'Ignace est aujourd'hui encore controversée. C.P.H. Bammel, «Ignatian Problems», *JTS NS* 33 (1982) 74, va jusqu'à contester la mention «dans l'Évangile» qui, à ses yeux, serait une glose.

Quelques hypothèses demanderaient un minimum de justifications scientifiques avant d'être avancées. Par exemple, l'A. lance l'idée que la fin du livre IV de l'*Adv. Haer.* serait l'œuvre d'une (hypothétique!) «école irénéenne». Mais cette hypothèse ne repose que sur les impressions fragiles d'une sensibilité du XX^e siècle («ampleur insolite de l'ouvrage», «obscurité du paln», «impression de redondance ressentie...»). Rein n'est examiné de la tradition manuscrite, aucune relecture patente du texte grec (ce serait nécessaire) n'est relevée. L'ouvrage de Ph. Bacq, *De l'Ancienne Alliance à la Nouvelle Alliance selon Irénée: unité du livre IV de l'Adv. Haer.* (Paris-Namur 1978), mentionné ailleurs (143), est oublié ici. Et puisqu'il s'agit de contester la citation qu'Irénée fait des paraboles à la fin du livre IV, il aurait peut-être été utile de prendre en considération l'étude de A. Orbe, *Parábolas*

evangélicas en San Ireneo. 2 vols (Madrid 1972). Enfin, bien que ce ne soit pas l'objet direct des recherches de notre auteur, il est pour le moins léger d'affirmer sans plus que «l'Église confrontée à la crise arienne... se dote d'une formulation normative des données de la foi, sur la base d'un symbole baptismal emprunté à l'Église de Césarée» (300). S'il s'agit bien de Nicée, l'origine du symbole qui aurait servi de trame nous reste encore obscure (cf. par exemple, O. Skarsaune, «A Neglected Detail in the Creed of Nicæa», *VC* 41,1 [1987] 34-54).

Une dernière question se pose à nous quant à l'exacte validité du témoignage d'Irénée sur l'état du canon des Écritures au deuxième siècle. Car Irénée est avant tout témoin de lui-même et il faut aussi tenir compte du caractère de son œuvre. Plus que jamais l'argument *e silentio* est ici inutilisable.

Pour revenir à l'ensemble de l'ouvrage, les vues exposées sont justes dans leurs grandes lignes, mais demanderaient plus de rigueur dans leur démonstration et plus de prudence dans bien des affirmations sommaires. Il s'agit sans doute d'un péché de jeunesse, pardonnable par ailleurs, car il faut admirer l'audace méritoire qui consiste à ne pas se laisser enfermer dans les bornes d'une étroite spécialité.

2, rue de Reims
F-6700 Strasbourg

Mariette CANÉVET

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

COLLOQUIUM BIBLICUM LOVANIENSE

Bijbelse Studiedagen te Leuven

Journée Bibliques de Louvain

The Colloquium Biblicum Lovanienses XLV will take place from 31 July – 2 August 1996 at the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium.

Theme: *The Scriptures in the Gospels. Intertextuality: The Use of the Old Testament in the Four Gospels.*

Proposals for offered short papers should be submitted to the President:

Professor Christopher Tuckett
President, Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense 1996
Centre for Biblical Studies — University of Manchester
Manchester M13 9 PL – England
Tel. +44 161 275 3607 — Fax +44 161 275 3613

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions all the books on biblical and related studies sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of a book in the list is no indication of an editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it, unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*.

Books, articles and offprints from periodicals sent to *Biblica* will be made available to the editor of the *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*.

Please address all books, correspondence, etc., to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italy.

AA.VV., *In Spiritu et Veritate*. Miscellanea di studi offerti al P. Anselmo Mattioli in occasione del suo 81° anno di età. Roma, Conferenza Italiana Ministri Provinciali Cappuccini Commissione per la Cultura, 1995. 718 p. 17,5 × 24,5

Adeney, Bernard T., *Strange Virtues*. Ethics in a Multicultural World. Leicester, APOLLOS, 1995. 286 p. 15,5 × 23. £12.99

Aguirre Monasterio, Rafael – **Rodriguez Carmona**, Antonio, *Vangeli sinottici e Atti degli Apostoli* (Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia 6). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1995. 339 p. 15,5 × 23. Lit. 46.000

Amsler, F., et al., *Le mystère apocryphe*. Introduction à une littérature méconnue (Essais bibliques 26). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1995. 152 p. 15 × 21. SFr 32,—

Avalos, Hector, *Illness and health care in the ancient Near East*. The role of the temple in Greece, Mesopotamia, and Israel (HSM 54). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995. xxv-463 p. 14 × 22,5. \$49.95

Baker, William R., *Personal Speech-Ethics in the Epistle of James* (WUNT 68). Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995. xvi-364 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 128,—

Balz, Horst – **Schneider**, Gerhard (a cura di), *Dizionario Esegetico del Nuovo Testamento*. Edizione italiana a cura di Omero Soffritti. I: *Aaron – Kapharnaoum*. Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1995. xxxviii-2024 col. 17 × 24

Barton, John, *Isaiah 1–39* (Old Testament Guides). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. 127 p. 14 × 21,5. £5.95–\$9.95

Baudoz, Jean-François, *Les miettes de la table*. Étude synoptique et socio-religieuse de Mt 15,21-28 et de Mc 7,24-30 (ÉB 27). Paris, Éditions J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 1995. 451 p. 16 × 24. FF 340

Bentoglio, Gabriele, *Apertura e disponibilità l'accoglienza nell'epistolaria paolina* (Tesi Gregoriana – Serie Teologia 2). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1995. 374 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 36.000 – \$24,00

Berger, Klaus, *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums*. Theologie des Neuen Testaments. 2. Auflage (UTB für Wissenschaft). Tübingen–Basel, Francke Verlag, 1995. xxvi-808 p. 18 × 24,5. DM 78 – SFr 74 – ÖS 577,—

Bindella, Francesco, *La Pentecoste alla luce della rivelazione del Nome divino*. Rivisitazione ermeneutica di Atti 2,1-13: il paradigma dell'Ut Unum Sint (Praesidium Assisiense 3). Assisi, Edizioni Porziuncola, 1995. 270 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 40.000

Bock, Susan, *Los Hunos: tradición e historia* (Antigüedad y cristianismo. Monografías históricas sobre la antigüedad tardía 9). Murcia, Universidad de Murcia, 1992. 503 p. 17 × 24. Ptas 5.000 – \$50

Borgen, Peder–Giversen, Søren (eds.), *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*. Aarhus, Aarhus University Press, 1995. 293 p. 17,5 × 24,5. DKK 230 – \$38.00 – £29.00

Bossuyt, Philippe – Radermakers, Jean, *Témoins de la Parole de la Grâce*. Lecture des Actes des Apôtres. 1. Texte. 2. Lecture Continue (Collection IET 16). Bruxelles, Éditions Institut d'Études Théologiques, 1995. 115 p. et 781 p. 16 × 24. FF 280 – FB 1680

Bovati, Pietro – Meynet, Roland, *Il libro del profeta Amos* (Retorica biblica 2). Roma, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1995. 474 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 55.000

Bovon, François, *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives*. Allison Park, Pickwick Publications, 1995. x-256 p. 13,5 × 21,5. \$35.00

Braun, Willi, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14* (SNTSMS 85). Cambridge, University Press, 1995. xii-221 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £32.50 – \$49.95

Brenner, Athalya (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna* (The Feminist Companion to the Bible 7). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. 336 p. 13,5 × 21,5. £16,50 – \$24.50

Brenner, Athalya (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to the Latter Prophets*. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. 384 p. 14 × 21,5. £16.50 – \$24.50

Brent, Sandy, D. – Giese, Ronald L. (eds.), *Cracking Old Testament Codes*. A Guide to Interpreting the Literary Genres of the Old Testament. Nashville, Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1995. xii-323 p. 15 × 23. \$24.99

Bultmann, Rudolf – Weiser, Artur, *Fede nel Nuovo Testamento*. Grande lessico del Nuovo Testamento (Lecture bibliche 13). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1995. 125 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 18.000

Cagni, Luigi (a cura di), *Le profezie di Mari* (Testi del Vicino Oriente Antico 2,2). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1995. 126 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 22.000

Chesnutt, Randall D., *From Death to Life*. Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth (JSP Supplement Series 16). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 1995. 308 p. 14 × 22. £37.50 – \$56.00

Craghan, John, *Ester – Giuditta – Tobia – Giona* (Leggere oggi la Bibbia 1.11). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1995. 186 p. 13 × 21. Lit. 24.000

Culbertson, Philip L., *A word fitly spoken*. Context, transmission, and adoption of the parables of Jesus (SUNY series in religious studies). Albany, State University of New York Press, 1995. xvi-390 p. 15 × 23. \$21.95

Daris, Sergio, *Papiri documentari greci del fondo Palau-Ribes* (P. Palau Rib.) (Estudis de Papirologia i Filologia Biblica 4). Barcelona, Institut de Teologia Fonamental Seminari de Papirologia, 1995. 148 p. 16,5 × 23,5

Day, Linda, *Three Faces of a Queen*. Characterization in the Books of Esther (JSOTSS 186). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. 254 p. 14 × 22. £30.00 – \$45.00

De Jonge, H. J. – de Ruyter, B. W. J. (eds.), *Totdat hij komst*. Eendiscussie over de wederkomst van Jezus Christus. Baarn, Uitgeverij Ten Have, 1995. 138 p. 12 × 20,5. Dfl 24,90

Dockery, David S., *Christian Scripture*. An Evangelical Perspective on Inspiration, Authority and Interpretation. Nashville, Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1995. xi-257. 15 × 23. \$19.99

Droin, Jean-Marc, *Le Livre des Lamentations*. Une traduction et un commentaire (La Bible, porte-Parole). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1995. 106 p. 15 × 21. SFr 29,—

Das Evangelium des Johannes. Aus dem Griechischen übersetzt von Harald Vocke (Insel-Bücherei 1139). Frankfurt am Main und Leipzig, Insel Verlag, 1995. 90 p. 12,5 × 18,5. DM 17,80

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*. Revised Edition (Biblica et Orientalia 19A). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1995. 252 p., + 19 tavv. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 54.000 – \$36.00

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Biblical Commission's Document "The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church"*. Text and Commentary (Subsidia Biblica 18). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1995. xvi-212 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 30.000

Frede, Hermann Josef, *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel* (Vetus Latina 1.1). Repertorium scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum saeculo nono antiquiorum siglis adpositis quae in editione Bibliorum Sacrorum iuxta veterem latinam versionem adhibentur. 4. aktualisierte Auflage. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1995. 1049 p. 16 × 24,5

Garuti, Paolo, O.P., *Alle origini dell'omiletica cristiana: la Lettera agli Ebrei*. Note di analisi retorica (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 38). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1995. viii-439 p. 17 × 23,5. \$35.00

Gentry, Peter John, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 38). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995. xxxvii-559 p. 15,5 × 20,5. Cloth: \$49.95; paper: \$33.95

Gibson, Jeffrey B. *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity* (JSNTSS 112). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 1995. 370 p. 14 × 22. £37.50 – \$56.00

Gilbert, Maurice, S.J., *La Sapienza di Salomone I* (Bibbia e preghiera 22) Roma, Edizioni ADP, 1995. 243 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 28.000

Grappe, Christian, *Images de Pierre aux deux premiers siècles* (Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 75). Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1995. 349 p. 15,5 × 24. FF 150

Grelot, Pierre, *La condition de la femme d'après le Nouveau Testament*. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1995. 167 p. 14 × 21,5. FF 110

Groß, Walter (Hrsg.), *Jeremia und die «deuteronomistische Bewegung»* (BBB 98). Weinheim, Beltz Athenäum, 1995. 397 p. 17 × 24,5. DM 98,—

Hauge, Martin Ravndal, *Between Sheol and Temple*. Motif Structure in the I-Psalms (JSOTSS 178). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 1995. 314 p. 14 × 22. £45.00 – \$67.50

Heil, John Paul, *Blood and Water*. The Death and Resurrection of Jesus in John 18–21 (CBQ Monograph Series 27). Washington, The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1995. xii-196 p. 15 × 23. \$9.00

Hengel, Martin, *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1995. xx-402 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £27.50

Hoffmann, Paul, *Tradition und Situation*. Studien zur Jesusüberlieferung in der Logienquelle und den synoptischen Evangelien (NTAbh 28). Münster, Aschendorff Verlag, 1995. v-390 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 93,—

Holladay, Carl H., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Volume III: Aristobulus (Texts and Translations 39; Pseudepigrapha Series 13). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995. x-225 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Holt, Else Kragelund, *Prophesying the Past*. The Use of Israel's History in the Book of Hosea (JSOTSS 194). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 1995. 160 p. 14 × 22. £27.50 – \$41.00

Die Interpretation der Bibel in der Kirche. Das Dokument der Päpstlichen Bibelkommission vom 23.4.1993 mit einer kommentierenden Einführung von Lothar Ruppert und einer Würdigung durch Hans-Josef Klauck (SBB 161). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995. 174 p. 13,5 × 21. DM 43,80

Irénée de Lyon, *Démonstration de la prédication apostolique* (SC 406). Introduction, traduction et notes par Adelin Rousseau. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995. 412 p. 12,5 × 19,5. FF 293

Jaquette, James J., *Discerning What Counts*. The Function of the *Adiaphora Topos* in Paul's Letters (SBLDS 146). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995. xiv-282 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$39.95; paper: \$24.95

Jones, F. Stanley, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71* (SBL Texts and Translations 37; Christian Apocrypha Series 2). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995. xiii-208 p. 16 × 23,5. \$39.95

KATA TOYΣ O' Selon les Septante. Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante en hommage à Marguerite Harl. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995. 539 p. 15,5 × 21,5. FF 450

Kuntzmann, Raymond (sous la direction de), *Ce Dieu qui vient*. Études sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament offertes au Professeur Bernard Renaud à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire (LD 159). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995. 422 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 200

Levy, Thomas E. (ed.), *The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land*. London, Leicester University Press, 1995. xvi-624 p. 20 × 25,5. £60.00

Lohmeyer, Monika, *Der Apostelbegriff im neuen Testament*. Eine Untersuchung auf dem Hintergrund der synoptischen Aussendungsreden (SBB 29). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995. xii-472 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 89 – ÖS 694 – SFr 87,—

Maggi, Alberto, *Padre dei poveri*. Traduzione e commento delle Beatitudini e del Padre Nostro di Matteo, Volume 1: Le Beatitudini (Orizzonti biblici). Assisi, Cittadella Editrice, 1995. 232 p. 13 × 19,5. Lit. 23.000

Manucci, Valerio, *Giovanni*. Il vangelo per ogni uomo (LoB 2,4). Brescia, Queriniana, 1995. 227 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 50.000

Mailberger, Paul, *Le grandi figure dell'Antico Testamento*. 40 storie di fede e di vita con spiegazione dei concetti più importanti dell'Antico Testamento (Biblioteca biblica 17). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1995. 236 p. 16 × 23. Lit. 35.000

Marafioti, Domenico, S.J., *Sant'Agostino e la Nuova Alleanza*. L'interpretazione agostiniana di Geremia 31,31-34 (Aloisiana 26). Roma, Gregorian University Press – Brescia, Morcelliana Editrice, 1995. 400 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 55.000

Maraval, Pierre, *Petite vie de Saint Jérôme*. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1995. 137 p. 11 × 17,5. FF 65

McKane, William, *A Late Harvest*. Reflections on the Old Testament. Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1995. x-182 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £19.95

Merklein, Helmut, *Die Jesusgeschichte – synoptisch gelesen*. Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995. 246 p. 15 × 23. DM 39,—

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D., *No Graven Image?* Israelite Aniconism in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context (ConBOT 42). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1995. 252 p. 16 × 23. SEK 192,—

Mineo, Sergio – Zappata, Emanuela (a cura di), *Bibliografia di Studi di Archeologia, Scienze dell'Antichità e Storia dell'Arte*. Roma, «L'Erma» di Bretschneider, 1995. xviii-526 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 50.000

Montagnes, Bernard, *Le Père Lagrange (1855-1938)*. L'exégèse catholique dans la crise moderniste (Histoire). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995. 246 p. 12,5 × 19,5. FF 125

Moores, John D., *Wrestling with rationality in Paul*. Romans 1–8 in a new perspective (SNTSMS 82). Cambridge, University Press, 1995. xvi-210 p. 14 × 22,5. £35.00 – \$54.95

Müller, Christoph Gregor, *Gottes Pflanzung – Gottes Bau – Gottes Tempel*. Die metaphorische Dimension paulinischer Gemeindeftheologie in I Kor 3,5-17 (Fuldaer Studien 5). Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Josef Knecht, 1995. xii-209 p. 17,5 × 24,5. DM 58 – SFr 58 – ÖS 453,—

Neiryneck, Frans, *Q-Synopsis*. The Double Tradition Passages in Greek (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 13). Leuven, University Press – Uitgeverij Peeters, 1995. 79 p. 16 × 24. BF 400

Nohrnberg, James, *Like unto Moses*. The Constituting of an Interruption (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature). Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1995. xix-396 p. 26 × 23,5. \$39.95

Padovese, L. (a cura di), *Atti del V simposio su S. Giovanni Apostolo* (Turchia: la Chiesa e la sua storia 8). Roma, Istituto di Spiritualità Franciscana, Pontificio Ateneo Antoniano, 1995. 247 p. 16 × 22,5

Pomykala, Kenneth E., *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism* (SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 7). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995. xv-308 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$39.95; paper: \$24.95

Porter, Stanley E. – Carson, D. A. (eds.), *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek* (JSNTSS 113). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 1995. 227 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$52.50

Rendtorff, Rolf, *Die "Bundesformel"*. Eine exegetisch-theologische Untersuchung (SBS 160). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995. 104 p. 13,5 × 21. DM 39,80

Revista Bíblica Brasileira. Ano 12: Número Especial 1-2-3. Fortaleza, Nova Jerusalém. 1995. 495 p. 16,5 × 22,5

Rodriguez, Angel Manuel, *Esther*. A Theological Approach. Berrien Springs, Andrews University Press, 1995. xii-162 p. 15 × 23. \$16.99

Schaberg, Jane, *The Illegitimacy of Jesus*. A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives (The Biblical Seminar 28). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. xi-262 p. 15,5 × 23. £12.50 – \$18.50

Schmeller, Thomas, *Hierarchie und Egalität*. Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine (SBS 162). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995. 120 p. 13,5 × 20,5. DM 39,80

Schramm, Brooks, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah*. Reconstruction of the Cultic History of the Restoration (JSOTSS 193). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. 216 p. 14 × 22. £30.00 – \$45.00

Shiner, Whitney Taylor, *Follow me! Disciples in Markan Rhetoric* (SBL Dissertation Series 145). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995. xviii-334 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$29.95; paper: \$19.95

Stendahl, Krister, *Paolo tra ebrei e pagani* (Piccola collana moderna. Serie teologica 74). Torino, Claudiana Editrice, 1995. 165 p. 12 × 20. Lit. 19.000

Stock, Klemens, S.J., *L'ultima parola è di Dio*. L'Apocalisse come Buona Notizia (Bibbia e preghiera 21). Roma, Edizioni ADP, 1995. 200 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 25.000

Strauss, Mark L., *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*. The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology (JSNTSS 110). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. 413 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$52.50

Sylva, Dennis, *Psalms and the Transformation of Stress*. Poetic-Communal Interpretation and the Family (Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs 16). Leuven, Peeters Press, 1995. 255 p. 13,5 × 20,5. BF 595,—

Tadmor, Hayim, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, King of Assyria*. Critical Edition, with Introductions, Translations and Commentary (Fontes ad res iudaicas spectantes). Jerusalem, The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994. xv-317 p.-LX plates. 19,5 × 27,5

Tosaus Abadía, José Pedro, *Cristo y el universo*. Estudio lingüístico y temático de Ef 1,10b, en Efesios y en la obra de Ireneo de Lyon (Plenitudo Temporis 2). Salamanca, Universidad Pontificia, 1995. 341 p. 17 × 24. Ptas 2.650

Trevethan, Thomas L., *The Beauty of God's Holiness*. Downers Grove – Leicester, InterVarsity Press, 1995. 278 p. 14 × 21. £9.99

Trevijano, Ramón, *Orígenes del cristianismo*. El trasfondo judío del cristianismo primitivo (Plenitudo Temporis 3). Salamanca, Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1995. 475 p. 17 × 24. Ptas 3.650

van der Lugt, Pieter, *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job* (OTS 32). Leiden – New York – Köln, E.J. Brill, 1995. xvi-548 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 230 – \$131.00

Vanoni, Gottfried, "*Du bist doch unser Vater*" (*Jes 63,16*). Zur Gottesvorstellung des Ersten Testaments (SBS 159). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995. 114 p. 13,5 × 21. DM 39,80

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12 (Pars II). *Esaias*. Fascicule 4. Is 44,5–46,13. Ed. Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1995. pp. 1041–1120. 24 × 32

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 22. *Epistula ad Corinthios I*. 1. Lieferung: Einleitung. Hrsg. U. **Fröhlich**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1995. 80 p. 24 × 32

Vignolo, Roberto, *Personaggi del Quarto Vangelo*. Figure della fede in San Giovanni. Milano, Facoltà Teologica dell'Italia Settentrionale, 1994. 249 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 28.000

Vogels, Walter, *Job*. L'homme qui a bien parlé de Dieu (Lire la Bible). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995. 268 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 120

Wallace, Ian G., *The faith of Jesus Christ in early Christian Traditions* (SNTS Monograph Series 84). Cambridge, University Press, 1995. XIX–281 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$59.95

Weber, Beat, *Psalm 77 und sein Umfeld*. Eine poetologische Studie (BBB 103). Weinheim, Beltz Athäneum Verlag, 1995. XIII–362 p. 17 × 24,5. DM 98,—

Wénin, André, *L'homme biblique*. Anthropologie et éthique dans le Premier Testament (Théologies bibliques). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995. 196 p. 14,5 × 23,5. FF 100

Widengren, Geo – **Hultgård**, Anders – **Philonenko**, Marc, *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme goumrânienne* (Recherches Intertestamentaires 2). Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve, 1995. II–225 p. 16 × 24

Winter, Bruce W., *Seek the Welfare of the City*. Christians as Benefactors and Citizens (First-Century Christians in the Greco-Roman World Series). Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company – Carlisle, The Paternoster Press, 1994. IX–245 p. 15 × 23. \$18.99

Witherington, Ben, *Jesus the Sage*. The Pilgrimage of Wisdom. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1994. XI–436 p. 16 × 24. £24.95

Young, Frances, *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (New Testament Theology). Cambridge, University Press, 1994. XI–170 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: £27.95 – \$49.95; £9.95 – \$14.95

Ysebaert, Joseph, *Die Amtsterminologie im Neuen Testament und in der Alten Kirche*. Eine lexikographische Untersuchung. Breda, EUREIA, 1994. VIII–238 p. 16 × 24. Dfl 55,—

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

Finito di stampare il 19 gennaio 1996
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma